



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

DOCUMENTS ON CHRISTIAN UNITY

1920-4

EDITED BY

G. K. A. BELL

DEAN OF CANTERBURY

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD

1924

PRINTED IN ENGLAND
AT THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
BY FREDERICK HALL

DEDICATED
BY PERMISSION
TO
THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

PREFACE

DURING the last four years a series of Appeals and Proposals for Christian Unity have been published, of a variety and importance remarkable in the history of the movement for the Reunion of Christendom. Encyclical Letters alike from Rome and from Constantinople have made the Unity of the Church in one way or another their special theme. The World Conference on Faith and Order received a new prominence in the public mind through the Preliminary Meeting held at Geneva in August 1920. And in particular, the 'Appeal to All Christian People', issued by the Lambeth Conference in 1920, gave what may fairly be described as a new impetus to the whole cause in many directions. Partly as a result of the 'Appeal', and partly owing to other causes, Conferences and discussions, with varying degrees of official authority, have taken place in all parts of the world. Moreover, quite apart from the Lambeth Appeal and its issues, actual schemes of union have gone forward, or have reached a new and decisive stage, in Australia, Canada, India, Scotland, the United States of America and elsewhere. The results up to date of these Conferences, and of the various projects and proposals for reunion are contained in this volume. It has not been possible to include everything, but all the main documents will, it is thought, be found within the pages which follow. Further it is hoped that the collection thus brought together will prove practically useful to those who may be called upon to take part in negotiations or in conversations leading

towards Church unity, and may itself contribute to the development and increase of that interest in the subject which is already so abundantly manifest.

The ninety documents which the book contains all date from 1920, with the exception of the first three documents in the South India series, which are included for purposes of completeness. All these documents are concerned with Church Unity. But in addition to them it has been thought well to print in an Appendix four important documents bearing on the co-operation of Christian Churches, or Christian people, for social, international, or missionary purposes.

It only remains for the Editor to express his gratitude to those who have so generously given him their help.

In the whole preparation of this book, I owe a very special debt to the Archbishop of Canterbury, without whose aid and encouragement (in many different ways) it could never have been compiled. I should further like to express my thanks to the Archbishop of York, who from the beginning has taken a close interest in the work which the book represents, and under whose Chairmanship some of the most important of the documents dealing with the 'Appeal to All Christian People' were evolved. Gratitude is also due to His Eminence Cardinal Mercier, Archbishop of Malines, for kindly allowing me to reprint his Letter to his Clergy on the Conversations at Malines; to the Bishop of Gloucester and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge for permission to include 'Terms of Inter-communion suggested between the Church of England and the Churches in Communion with her and the Eastern

Orthodox Church ' ; to the Reverend J. Scott Lidgett, D.D., and the Reverend J. H. Shakespeare, D.D., Moderator and Secretary of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches, and to the Reverend A. E. Garvie, D.D., and the Reverend T. Nightingale, President and Secretary of the National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches, for consenting to the inclusion of ' The Free Churches and the Lambeth Appeal ' as well as other Statements issued jointly or separately by the two Councils ; to the Religious Tract Society, the original publishers of that Report, and to the Reverend P. Carnegie Simpson, D.D., for help with regard to this and similar documents ; to the Reverend J. J. Banninga, D.D., Secretary of the General Assembly of the South India United Church, for placing at my disposal various documents dealing with the Union Movement in South India ; to Mr. Robert H. Gardiner for his ready help and permission in all that concerns the World Conference on Faith and Order ; and to the Reverend W. H. Warriner, D.D., the Reverend T. Albert Moore, D.D., and the Reverend J. H. Edmison, D.D., Secretaries of the Joint Committee on Church Union, for permission to print the full text of "The Basis of Union for the United Church of Canada ' .

In addition I should like to record my genuine gratitude to many others who have assisted in the compilation of this volume, whether by information, permission, or advice. The authorities of the different Communion and Societies concerned have in every case given me the permission for which I asked with every indication of goodwill. I have done my best to apply for such permission where there seemed to be any question of copyright being involved. But

if I have failed to apply in any particular case I hope that such omission will be taken as due to inadvertence and not to discourtesy. I am indebted especially for help of this kind in documents relating to the Roman Catholic Church to the Reverend Herbert Thurston, S.J., and the Editor of the *Tablet*; and here I ought perhaps to explain that the translation contained in this volume of the Encyclical Letter *Ecclesiam Dei* was prepared and in type before I knew of that subsequently published by Messrs. Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. With regard to documents relating to the Eastern Orthodox Church I am indebted to the Right Reverend J. H. Darlington, D.D., Bishop of Harrisburg, the Reverend J. A. Douglas, B.D. (Editor of *The Christian East*), and the Reverend W. C. Emhardt, Ph.D. In connexion with the documents coming from the Free Churches I desire to thank the Reverend J. H. Shakespeare, D.D. (Baptist Union); the Reverend S. M. Berry (Congregational Union); the late Bishop Gibson, D.D., and Bishop Mumford (Moravian Church); the Reverend W. L. Robertson (Presbyterian Church of England); the Reverend George Armitage (Primitive Methodist Church); the Reverend David Brook, D.C.L. (United Methodist Church); the Reverend Aldom French, the Reverend T. Kirkup, and the Reverend J. Scott Lidgett, D.D. (Wesleyan Methodist Church); and the Reverend J. M. Lloyd Thomas (Society of Free Catholics). In the section relating to Scotland I owe thanks for permission to reprint documents bearing on the Lambeth Appeal to the Right Reverend George Milligan, D.D., Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and the Right Reverend David Cairns, D.D., Moderator of the General

Assembly of the United Free Church of Scotland. For valuable help in connexion with Presbyterian Reunion in Scotland I desire to give special thanks to the Reverend Archibald Henderson, D.D. I have to thank the Archbishop of Upsala for permission to print the Reply of the Bishops of the Church of Sweden to the Resolutions of the Lambeth Conference 1920. I am indebted again in similar ways to the Reverend J. R. Fleming, D.D., General Secretary of the Alliance of Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian System ; to the Reverend J. W. Arthur, M.D., Chairman of the Alliance of Missionary Societies in Kenya Colony ; to the Reverend W. C. Emhardt, Ph.D., Mr. Robert H. Gardiner, and the Reverend Newman Smyth, D.D., for help in connexion with proposals and resolutions in the United States of America ; to the Bishop of Willochra, the Reverend Canon P. A. Micklem, the Reverend D. S. Adam, D.D., Convener of the Joint Committee on Union, the Reverend W. H. Robinson, Secretary of South Australia Conference, Methodist Church of Australasia, and Messrs. Angus and Robertson Ltd., publishers of *Australia and Reunion*, for similar help with regard to the Reunion Movement in Australia ; to the Archbishop of Rupert's Land, the Bishop of Montreal, the Reverend Canon H. J. Cody, D.D., and to the Reverend W. G. Wallace, D.D., Joint Clerk to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, in connexion with documents relating to Canada ; to the Right Reverend Frank L. Norris, D.D., Bishop in North China ; to the Metropolitan of India, the Bishop of Bombay, the Bishop of Dornakal, and Bishop Whitehead, D.D., for help in regard to South India ; to the Archbishop of Armagh, the Archbishop of Dublin, and the Bishop of Down, for help in

matters relating to Ireland ; to the Reverend J. R. MacKenzie (Clerk of Assembly, Presbyterian Church of New Zealand) ; to the Right Hon. Sir Willoughby Dickinson, K.B.E., Secretary of the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches ; to Mr. J. H. Oldham, Secretary of the International Missionary Council ; to the Archbishop of Upsala, for documents relating to the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work ; and to Sir Henry Lunn, M.D., in connexion with the Murren Conference.

Finally I should like to thank the Reverend Claude Jenkins, Librarian at Lambeth Palace, for his unfailing help readily given at all times ; Miss Gwen V. Fuller for her valuable secretarial assistance ; and all those who from time to time have allowed me to trespass on their kindness in preparing this book. To the aid and counsel given by my wife I owe much in different ways, but I should not like to close my list of acknowledgements without a mention of this special debt.

Easter 1924.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE 1920.	
1. An Appeal to All Christian People. August 1920	1
2. Resolutions (10-31) on the Reunion of Christendom. August 1920	5
3. Suggestions of the Sub-Committee on Reunion with non-Episcopal Churches. August 1920	13
II. THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER.	
4. The Original Suggestion to the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Cincinnati, Ohio, October 1910. December 1922	15
5. Questions for Preliminary Discussion on the part of local group conferences in preparation for the World- wide Conference. August 1920	17
Topics discussed at the Preliminary Meeting in Geneva, August 1920	17
First Series of Questions proposed by the Subjects Committee. Concerning the Faith of the re- united Church	17
Second Series of Questions proposed by the Subjects Committee. Concerning the Ministry in the reunited Church	18
6. Third Series of Questions suggested by the Subjects Committee. The Church. September 1923	18
7. Statement based on the Replies to the First Series of World Conference Questions. Adopted by the Subjects Committee September 1923	19
8. Resolutions of the Subjects Committee on the Agenda and Method of the World Conference. September 1923	24
9. List of Churches which have appointed Commissions or have otherwise signified their participation in the World Conference. December 1922.	25

III. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

- | | |
|--|----|
| 10. Letter transmitting the Lambeth Appeal to His Holiness Pope Benedict XV together with Reply. May 1921 | 29 |
| 11. Extract from Encyclical Letter of His Holiness Pope Pius XI (<i>Ubi Arcano Dei</i>). December 1922 | 30 |
| 12. Encyclical Letter of His Holiness Pope Pius XI (<i>Ecclesiam Dei</i>) on the 300th Anniversary of St. Josaphat the Martyr, Archbishop of Polock. November 1923 | 32 |

IV. THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH.

- | | |
|--|----|
| 13. Encyclical Letter from the Patriarchate of Constantinople. January 1920 | 44 |
| 14. Proposed Concordat: Terms of Agreement between Eastern Orthodox, Old Catholic and Anglican Churches, proposed as Basis of Restoration of Corporate Unity and Intercommunion. Drawn up by a Commission of the American Episcopal Church. 1920 | 49 |
| 15. Proposed Concordat: Letter from the Locum Tenens of the Oecumenical Patriarchate. June 1920 | 51 |
| 16. Report of the Delegation of the Patriarchate of Constantinople sent to the Lambeth Conference 1920 | 52 |
| 17. Terms of Intercommunion suggested between the Church of England and the Churches in Communion with her and the Eastern Orthodox Church. Drawn up at the request of the Eastern Churches Committee. 1921 | 77 |
| 18. Declaration of Faith: 'To His Holiness the Oecumenical Patriarch and the Holy Synod of the Great Church of Constantinople', prepared by a Committee of the English Church Union. May 1922 | 90 |
| 19. Constantinople and Anglican Ordinations. Letter of the Oecumenical Patriarch to the Archbishop of Canterbury. July 1922 | 93 |
| 20. Encyclical on Anglican Ordinations. From the Oecumenical Patriarch to the Presidents of the Particular Eastern Orthodox Churches. August 1922 | 94 |
| 21. Anglican Ordinations. Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury from the Patriarch of Jerusalem. February 1923 | 97 |

	PAGE
22. Anglican Ordinations. Letter to the Oecumenical Patriarch from the Archbishop of Cyprus. March 1923	98

V. THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

23. The National Assembly of the Church of England. Resolution on the Lambeth Appeal. November 18, 1920	100
24. Convocation of Canterbury, Upper House. Resolution on the Lambeth Appeal. February 24, 1921	100
25. Convocation of York, Upper House. Resolution. February 23, 1921	100
26. Convocation of York, Lower House. Resolution and Rider. February 23, 1921	101
27. Convocation of Canterbury, Upper House. Resolution. April 27, 1921	101
28. Convocation of Canterbury, Lower House. Resolution and Rider. July 6-7, 1921	102
29. Convocation of York. Resolutions on Christian Reunion. February 15-16, 1922	102

VI. THE FREE CHURCHES IN ENGLAND AND THE LAMBETH APPEAL.

30. The Baptist Union. Resolution of the Annual Assembly. April 27, 1921	104
31. The Presbyterian Church of England. Resolution of the General Assembly. May 5, 1921	104
32. The Congregational Union. Resolution of the Annual Assembly. May 10, 1921	105
33. The Primitive Methodist Church. Resolution of the Annual Conference. June 15-23, 1921	107
34. The United Methodist Church. Resolution of the Annual Conference. July 15, 1921	108
35. The Wesleyan Methodist Church. Resolution of the Annual Conference. July 16, 1921	109
36. The Wesleyan Methodist Church. Reply to the 'Appeal to All Christian People' adopted by the Annual Conference. July 1922	110
37. The Moravian Church. Resolutions of the British Provincial Synod. July 1921	115
38. The Moravian Church. Resolution of the British Provincial Synod. July 1923	116

	PAGE
39. Free Catholics and the Lambeth Report. December 1920	116
40. The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England and The National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England. Provisional Statement on 'An Appeal to All Christian People'. September 28, 1920	118
41. The Free Churches and the Lambeth Appeal. Report of a Committee appointed by the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England and the National Free Church Council. May 1921	120
42. The Federal Council. Resolutions of the Annual Assembly. September 1921	141
43. The National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches. Resolution adopted at its Assembly. March 1922	143
44. 'Church Unity'. The Report of a Joint Conference held at Lambeth Palace, together with a Preliminary Statement by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Moderator of the Federal Council. May 1922	143
45. The Federal Council. Resolutions adopted by the Annual Assembly. September 1922	151
46. Memorandum on the Status of the Existing Free Church Ministry. Presented on behalf of the Church of England Representatives on the Joint Conference at Lambeth Palace. July 6, 1923	156
47. The Federal Council. Resolutions adopted by the Annual Assembly. September 18, 1923	164

VII. THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND AND THE UNITED FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

48. The Church of Scotland Act. 1921	170
49. The Church of Scotland. Resolution of the General Assembly on the Lambeth Appeal. May 31, 1921.	177
50. The Church of Scotland. Report of Committee on Church and Nation on Lambeth Proposals, and Resolution of the General Assembly. May 24, 1922	177
51. The United Free Church of Scotland. Resolution of the General Assembly on the Lambeth Appeal. May 31, 1921	179
52. The United Free Church of Scotland. Response of the General Assembly to the Lambeth Appeal. May 29, 1922	180

VIII. THE CHURCH OF SWEDEN.

53. The Reply of the Bishops of the Church of Sweden to the Resolutions of the Lambeth Conference 1920. April 1922. 185

IX. CHURCHES HOLDING THE PRESBYTERIAN SYSTEM.

54. The General Council of the Alliance of the Reformed Churches throughout the World holding the Presbyterian System: Resolutions on the Lambeth Appeal. Pittsburg. September 21, 1921 196

X. EAST AFRICA.

55. Conference of the Alliance of Missionary Societies in Kenya Colony. Resolutions on the Lambeth Appeal. January 23-27, 1922 198

XI. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

56. Agreement on the Affiliation between the Hungarian Reformed Church in America and the Protestant Episcopal Church. October 1921 200
57. The Protestant Episcopal Church. General Convention. Resolutions of the House of Bishops on the Lambeth Appeal. (I) September 15, 1922. (II) September 21, 1922 205
58. The Protestant Episcopal Church. Canon II. Of the Ordination of Deacons and Priests in Special Cases. (The Concordat Canon.) September 1922 207
59. The National Council of the Congregational Churches. Additional Statement by the Commission on Comity, Federation and Unity. October 20, 1923 210
60. The Protestant Episcopal Church and the Czecho-Slovak Orthodox Church in America. Resolution of the National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church. December 13, 1922 214

XII. AUSTRALIA.

61. Resolutions adopted by the Reunion Conference between representatives of the Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches in Australia at Sydney. March 28-29, 1922 217
62. Some Proposals on Preliminary Action towards closer fellowship. Memorandum by the Bishop of Willochra. March 1922 219

	PAGE
63. Report of the Second Reunion Conference between representatives of the Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches in Australia at Cronulla. May 1-3, 1923	221
64. Methodist Church of Australasia. Resolutions on the Lambeth Appeal adopted by the Seventh General Conference. May 1923	227
Additional Note on the Proposed Union between the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches of Australia	229
 XIII. CANADA.	
65. The United Church of Canada. The Basis of Union as agreed upon by the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches in Canada. January 1924	231
66. Report of Conferences between the Committee of the Presbytery of Montreal on the Reunion of the Churches in relation to the Lambeth Conference (1920) and a similar Committee appointed by the Bishop of Montreal. May 1921	261
67. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. Resolutions on the Lambeth Appeal. June 1921	267
68. The General Synod of the Church of England in Canada. Resolutions on the Lambeth Appeal. October 1921	268
69. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. Statement from Union Committee on the Appeal of the Lambeth Conference, and Reply of the General Assembly. June 1922	271
 XIV. CHINA.	
70. The General Synod of the Chung-hua Sheng Kung Hui. Resolutions on the Lambeth Appeal. April 1921	276
 XV. SOUTH INDIA.	
71. Statement drawn up by Thirty-three Ministers of the Anglican and South India United Churches at Tranquebar. May 1919	278
72. Statement from the Malabar Suffragan and other Members of the Mar Thoma Syrian Church. June 1919	281

	PAGE
73. Resolutions on Church Union adopted by the General Assembly of the South India United Church. September 1919	285
74. Resolution of the Episcopal Synod of the Province of India and Ceylon. February 1920	286
75. First Preliminary Report of the Joint Sub-Committee. March 1920	287
76. Second Preliminary Report of the Joint Sub-Committee. December 1920	292
77. Resolution of the Third Meeting of the Joint Committee. June 1921	296
78. Recommendations adopted by the General Assembly of the S.I.U.C. September 1921	308
79. Resolutions adopted by the Provincial Council of the Church of the Province of India, Burma and Ceylon. January 1922	310
80. Resolutions of the Fourth Meeting of the Joint Committee. April 1923	311
81. Resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the S.I.U.C. August 1923	328

XVI. IRELAND.

82. The General Synod of the Church of Ireland. Resolution on the Lambeth Appeal. May 10, 1921	330
83. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. Resolution on the Lambeth Appeal. June 14, 1921	330

XVII. NEW ZEALAND.

84. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand. Deliverance on the Lambeth Appeal. November 16, 1921	331
85. The General Synod of the Church of the Province of New Zealand. Resolution on the Lambeth Appeal. May 1, 1922	334

XVIII. WALES.

86. The Council of the Evangelical Churches of Wales. Resolution on the Lambeth Appeal. December 1920	335
87. The Annual Assembly of the Welsh Congregational Union. Resolution on the Lambeth Appeal. June 1921	335

XIX. THE WEST INDIES.

88. The Synod of the Bishops of the Church of the Province
of the West Indies. Resolutions on the Lambeth
Appeal. August 1922 337

XX. REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM.

89. Letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the
Archbishops and Metropolitans of the Anglican Com-
munion. Christmas 1923 338

XXI. THE CONVERSATIONS AT MALINES.

90. Letter from Cardinal Mercier to his Clergy, January
1924 349

APPENDIX

- I. The World Alliance for Promoting International
Friendship through the Churches. Constitution and
International Committee as agreed August 1920 . . . 366
- II. The International Missionary Council. Constitution
October 1921 370
Resolution on Missionary Co-operation in view of
Doctrinal Differences. July 1923 374
- III. The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work,
to be held at Stockholm 1925 376
 - (a) Programme of the Conference, adopted at
Hälsingborg, August 1922 377
 - (b) Statement as to membership, adopted at
Hälsingborg, August 1922 377
 - (c) A Letter defining the Relation of the Con-
ference to the World Conference on Faith and
Order, adopted at Hälsingborg, August 1922 . . . 377
 - (d) Aim of the Conference, as defined by the
International Executive Committee at Zurich,
April 1923 379
- IV. The Murren Conference. The Church and Social
Problems. September 1923 379

I. THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE 1920

1. *An Appeal to All Christian People*

FROM THE BISHOPS ASSEMBLED IN THE LAMBETH
CONFERENCE OF 1920

WE, Archbishops, Bishops Metropolitan, and other Bishops of the Holy Catholic Church in full communion with the Church of England, in Conference assembled, realizing the responsibility which rests upon us at this time and sensible of the sympathy and the prayers of many, both within and without our own Communion, make this appeal to all Christian people.

We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ which is His Body. We believe that the Holy Spirit has called us in a very solemn and special manner to associate ourselves in penitence and prayer with all those who deplore the divisions of Christian people, and are inspired by the vision and hope of a visible unity of the whole Church.

I. We believe that God wills fellowship. By God's own act this fellowship was made in and through Jesus Christ, and its life is in His Spirit. We believe that it is God's purpose to manifest this fellowship, so far as this world is concerned, in an outward, visible, and united society, holding one faith, having its own recognized officers, using God-given means of grace, and inspiring all its members to the world-wide service of the Kingdom of God. This is what we mean by the Catholic Church.

II. This united fellowship is not visible in the world to-day. On the one hand there are other ancient episcopal

Communions in East and West, to whom ours is bound by many ties of common faith and tradition. On the other hand there are the great non-episcopal Communions, standing for rich elements of truth, liberty and life which might otherwise have been obscured or neglected. With them we are closely linked by many affinities, racial, historical and spiritual. We cherish the earnest hope that all these Communions, and our own, may be led by the Spirit into the unity of the Faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God. But in fact we are all organized in different groups, each one keeping to itself gifts that rightly belong to the whole fellowship, and tending to live its own life apart from the rest.

III. The causes of division lie deep in the past, and are by no means simple or wholly blameworthy. Yet none can doubt that self-will, ambition, and lack of charity among Christians have been principal factors in the mingled process, and that these, together with blindness to the sin of disunion, are still mainly responsible for the breaches of Christendom. We acknowledge this condition of broken fellowship to be contrary to God's will, and we desire frankly to confess our share in the guilt of thus crippling the Body of Christ and hindering the activity of His Spirit.

IV. The times call us to a new outlook and new measures. The Faith cannot be adequately apprehended and the battle of the Kingdom cannot be worthily fought while the body is divided, and is thus unable to grow up into the fullness of the life of Christ. The time has come, we believe, for all the separated groups of Christians to agree in forgetting the things which are behind and reaching out towards the goal of a reunited Catholic Church. The removal of the barriers which have arisen between them will only be brought about by a new comradeship of those whose faces are definitely set this way.

The vision which rises before us is that of a Church,

genuinely Catholic, loyal to all Truth, and gathering into its fellowship all 'who profess and call themselves Christians', within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present, shall be possessed in common, and made serviceable to the whole Body of Christ. Within this unity Christian Communion now separated from one another would retain much that has long been distinctive in their methods of worship and service. It is through a rich diversity of life and devotion that the unity of the whole fellowship will be fulfilled.

V. This means an adventure of goodwill and still more of faith, for nothing less is required than a new discovery of the creative resources of God. To this adventure we are convinced that God is now calling all the members of His Church.

VI. We believe that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole-hearted acceptance of:—

The Holy Scriptures, as the record of God's revelation of Himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; and the Creed commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and either it or the Apostles' Creed as the Baptismal confession of belief:

The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ:

A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body.

VII. May we not reasonably claim that the Episcopate is the one means of providing such a ministry? It is not that we call in question for a moment the spiritual reality of the ministries of those Communion which do not possess

the Episcopate. On the contrary, we thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace. But we submit that considerations alike of history and of present experience justify the claim which we make on behalf of the Episcopate. Moreover, we would urge that it is now and will prove to be in the future the best instrument for maintaining the unity and continuity of the Church. But we greatly desire that the office of a Bishop should be everywhere exercised in a representative and constitutional manner, and more truly express all that ought to be involved for the life of the Christian Family in the title of Father-in-God. Nay more, we eagerly looked forward to the day when through its acceptance in a united Church we may all share in that grace which is pledged to the members of the whole body in the apostolic rite of the laying-on of hands, and in the joy and fellowship of a Eucharist in which as one Family we may together, without any doubtfulness of mind, offer to the one Lord our worship and service.

VIII. We believe that for all the truly equitable approach to union is by the way of mutual deference to one another's consciences. To this end, we who send forth this appeal would say that if the authorities of other Communion should so desire, we are persuaded that, terms of union having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted, Bishops and clergy of our Communion would willingly accept from these authorities a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregations, as having its place in the one family life. It is not in our power to know how far this suggestion may be acceptable to those to whom we offer it. We can only say that we offer it in all sincerity as a token of our longing that all ministries of grace, theirs and ours, shall be available for the service of our Lord in a united Church.

It is our hope that the same motive would lead ministers

who have not received it to accept a commission through episcopal ordination, as obtaining for them a ministry throughout the whole fellowship.

In so acting no one of us could possibly be taken to repudiate his past ministry. God forbid that any man should repudiate a past experience rich in spiritual blessings for himself and others. Nor would any of us be dishonouring the Holy Spirit of God, whose call led us all to our several ministries, and whose power enabled us to perform them. We shall be publicly and formally seeking additional recognition of a new call to wider service in a reunited Church, and imploring for ourselves God's grace and strength to fulfil the same.

IX. The spiritual leadership of the Catholic Church in days to come, for which the world is manifestly waiting, depends upon the readiness with which each group is prepared to make sacrifices for the sake of a common fellowship, a common ministry, and a common service to the world.

We place this ideal first and foremost before ourselves and our own people. We call upon them to make the effort to meet the demands of a new age with a new outlook. To all other Christian people whom our words may reach we make the same appeal. We do not ask that any one Communion should consent to be absorbed in another. We do ask that all should unite in a new and great endeavour to recover and to manifest to the world the unity of the Body of Christ for which He prayed.

2. Resolutions (10-31) on the Reunion of Christendom

10. The Conference recommends to the authorities of the Churches of the Anglican Communion that they should, in such ways and at such times as they think best, formally invite the authorities of other Churches within their areas

to confer with them concerning the possibility of taking definite steps to co-operate in a common endeavour, on the lines set forth in the above Appeal, to restore the unity of the Church of Christ.

11. The Conference recognizes that the task of effecting union with other Christian Communion must be undertaken by the various national, regional, or provincial authorities of the Churches within the Anglican Communion, and confidently commits to them the carrying out of this task on lines that are in general harmony with the principles underlying its Appeal and Resolutions.

12. The Conference approves the following statements as representing the counsel which it is prepared to give to the Bishops, Clergy, and other members of our own Communion on various subjects which bear upon the problems of reunion, provided that such counsel is not to be regarded as calling in question any Canons or official declarations of any Synod or House of Bishops of a national, regional, or provincial Church which has already dealt with these matters.

(A) In view of prospects and projects of reunion—

(i) A Bishop is justified in giving occasional authorization to ministers, not episcopally ordained, who in his judgement are working towards an ideal of union such as is described in our Appeal, to preach in churches within his Diocese, and to clergy of the Diocese to preach in the churches of such ministers :

(ii) The Bishops of the Anglican Communion will not question the action of any Bishop who, in the few years between the initiation and the completion of a definite scheme of union, shall countenance the irregularity of admitting to Communion the baptized but unconfirmed Communicants of the non-episcopal congregations concerned in the scheme :

(iii) The Conference gives its general approval to the suggestions contained in the report of the Sub-Committee on Reunion with Non-Episcopal Churches in reference to the status and work of ministers who may remain after union without episcopal ordination (see pages 142 and 143.)¹

(B) Believing, however, that certain lines of action might imperil both the attainment of its ideal and the unity of its own Communion, the Conference declares that—

(i) It cannot approve of general schemes of inter-communion or exchange of pulpits :

(ii) In accordance with the principle of Church order set forth in the Preface to the Ordinal attached to the Book of Common Prayer, it cannot approve the celebration in Anglican churches of the Holy Communion for members of the Anglican Church by ministers who have not been episcopally ordained ; and that it should be regarded as the general rule of the Church that Anglican communicants should receive Holy Communion only at the hands of ministers of their own Church, or of Churches in communion therewith.

(C) In view of doubts and varieties of practice which have caused difficulties in the past, the Conference declares that—

(i) Nothing in these Resolutions is intended to indicate that the rule of Confirmation as conditioning admission to the Holy Communion must necessarily apply to the case of baptized persons who seek Communion under conditions which in the Bishop's judgement justify their admission thereto.

(ii) In cases in which it is impossible for the Bishop's judgement to be obtained beforehand the priest should remember that he has no canonical authority to refuse Communion to any baptized person kneeling before the Lord's Table (unless he be excommunicate by name, or,

¹ Report of Lambeth Conference 1920. In this volume pp. 13, 14.

in the canonical sense of the term, a cause of scandal to the faithful) ; and that, if a question may properly be raised as to the future admission of any such person to Holy Communion, either because he has not been confirmed or for other reasons, the priest should refer the matter to the Bishop for counsel or direction.

13. The Conference recommends that, wherever it has not already been done, Councils representing all Christian Communities should be formed within such areas as may be deemed most convenient, as centres of united effort to promote the physical, moral, and social welfare of the people, and the extension of the rule of Christ among all nations and over every region of human life.

14. It is important to the cause of reunion that every branch of the Anglican Communion should develop the constitutional government of the Church and should make a fuller use of the capacities of its members for service.

15. The Conference urges on every branch of the Anglican Communion that it should prepare its members for taking their part in the universal fellowship of the re-united Church, by setting before them the loyalty which they owe to the universal Church, and the charity and understanding which are required of the members of so inclusive a society.

16. We desire to express our profound thankfulness for the important movements towards unity which, during the last twelve years, have taken place in many parts of the world, and for the earnest desire for reunion which has been manifested both in our own Communion and among the Churches now separated from us. In particular, the Conference has heard with sympathetic and hopeful interest of the preliminary meeting of the proposed World Conference on Faith and Order about to be held at Geneva and earnestly prays that its deliberations may tend towards the reunion of the Christian Church.

17. We desire to express our deep sympathy with the Church of Russia in the terrible persecution which it has in many places suffered. We earnestly trust that in the providence of God its difficulties may speedily be removed, and that it may be enabled in renewed life and strength so to carry on its work unhindered as to further, in the life of the Russian people, whatsoever things are true and just, whatsoever things are lovely and of good report.

18. The Conference heartily thanks the Oecumenical Patriarchate for the mission of the Metropolitan of Demotica and others to confer with its members on questions concerning the relations between the Anglican and Eastern Churches, and expresses its grateful appreciation of the great help given to its Committee by the Delegation.

19. The Conference welcomes the appointment by the Archbishop of Canterbury of an 'Eastern Churches Committee' on a permanent basis, in pursuance of Resolution 61 of the Conference of 1908; and looks forward hopefully to the work of that Committee, in conjunction with similar Committees appointed in Constantinople and Athens, as helping greatly to forward the cause of reunion with the Orthodox Church.

20. The Conference expresses its heartfelt sympathy with the Armenian, Assyrian, and Syrian Jacobite Christians in the persecutions which they have been called upon to endure, deploring with indignation the terrible massacres that have taken place among them both before and during the Great War; and earnestly prays that in the rearrangement of the political affairs of the East they may be granted a righteous government and freedom from oppression for the future.

21. The Conference has received with satisfaction its Committee's report of the investigations that have been made during the last twelve years with regard to the present

doctrinal position of the Separated Churches of the East ; and, without expressing an opinion as to the past, believes that these investigations have gone far towards showing that any errors as to the Incarnation of our Lord, which may at some period of their history have been attributed to them, have at any rate now passed away.

22. The Conference repeats the proposal made by the Conference of 1908 that, when any of the Separated Churches of the East desire closer relations with us, and wish for the establishment of occasional intercommunion, and give satisfactory assurances as to their faith, such relations should at once be established.

23. The Conference respectfully requests the Archbishop of Canterbury to take advantage of any opportunity that may arise to enter into friendly relations with these Churches, and to inform the authorities of the Orthodox Eastern Church of any steps that may be taken in the direction of intercommunion with them. Similar action should be taken with regard to informing the Metropolitans of our own Communion.

24. The Conference welcomes the Report of the Commission appointed after the last Conference entitled, 'The Church of England and the Church of Sweden,' and, accepting the conclusions there maintained on the succession of the Bishops of the Church of Sweden and the conception of the priesthood set forth in its standards, recommends that members of that Church, qualified to receive the Sacrament in their own Church, should be admitted to Holy Communion in ours. It also recommends that on suitable occasions permission should be given to Swedish ecclesiastics to give addresses in our churches.

If the authorities of any province of the Anglican Communion find local irregularities in the order or practice of the Church of Sweden outside that country, they may legitimately, within their own region, postpone any such

action as is recommended in this Resolution until they are satisfied that these irregularities have been removed.

25. We recommend further that in the event of an invitation being extended to an Anglican Bishop or Bishops to take part in the consecration of a Swedish Bishop, the invitation should, if possible, be accepted, subject to the approval of the Metropolitan. We also recommend that, in the first instance, as an evident token of the restoration of closer relations between the two Churches, if possible more than one of our Bishops should take part in the Consecration.

26. The Conference thanks the Old Catholic Bishops for their explanation, in response to the letter of the Archbishop of Canterbury, of their action in consecrating the Rev. A. H. Mathew to the Episcopate in 1908, and repeats the desire expressed at previous Conferences to maintain and strengthen the friendly relations which exist between the Churches of the Anglican Communion and the ancient Church of Holland and the Old Catholic Churches, especially in Germany, Switzerland, and Austria.

27. We regret that on a review of all the facts we are unable to regard the so-called Old Catholic Church in Great Britain (under the late Bishop Mathew and his successors), and its extensions overseas, as a properly constituted Church, or to recognize the orders of its ministers, and we recommend that, in the event of any of its ministers desiring to join our communion, who are in other respects duly qualified, they should be ordained *sub conditione* in accordance with the provisions suggested in the Report of our Committee.

28. The Conference recommends that the same course be followed, as occasion may require, in the case of persons claiming to have received consecration or ordination from any 'episcopi vagantes', whose claims we are unable to recognize.

29. The Conference, while welcoming the Report of the Committee appointed by the Conference of 1908 on the *Unitas Fratrum* or Moravians, regrets that it is unable to recommend any such action being taken as is suggested in Resolutions 70-72 of that Conference so long as the *Unitas* retains its practice of the administration of Confirmation and the celebration of Holy Communion by deacons, but hopes that, in the event of the *Unitas* changing its rules in these matters, negotiations with individual Provinces of the *Unitas* may be resumed, and believes that in this case there would be good prospect of such negotiations being brought to a satisfactory conclusion.

30. We recommend with a view to this end that the Archbishop of Canterbury be respectfully requested to reappoint with additional members the Committee appointed at the last Conference ; and we hope that, in the event of all the remaining difficulties being removed to his satisfaction, with the concurrence of the Central Consultative Body of the Lambeth Conference, the action suggested in the Resolutions of the Conference of 1908 may take place without further delay.

31. The Conference regrets that it is unable to recommend the acceptance of the proposals of the ' Southern Synod ' of the ' Reformed Episcopal Church ' in England for reunion with the Church of England, and, while unable to advise the acceptance of other proposals for corporate union with the Reformed Episcopal Church, recommends that, if applications for admission into the English Church are made by individual ministers of that Communion, such applications should be sympathetically received, and the ministers, if in all respects equal to the standard and requirements of the Church of England, be ordained *sub conditione*.

3. *Suggestions¹ of the Sub-Committee on Reunion with Non-Episcopal Churches*

(EXTRACTS FROM REPORT OF LAMBETH CONFERENCE,
1920, pp. 142, 143)

It is plainly impossible to draft Resolutions which would meet every case that might arise anywhere in the course of negotiations for union or to suggest terms of union to meet every contingency. Great freedom must be left to the local negotiators, though in the exercise of it they must remember that similar negotiations in other places will be affected by what they do. Too great independence of action in one place may compromise action already taken elsewhere in stricter conformity with the words of the foregoing Resolutions. No Communion, whether our own or another, conducting negotiations in several places, will consent to seriously divergent treatment of points which it counts fundamental.

With these considerations in mind we offer suggestions on one case, at the request of some of our number. Some Provinces of our Communion, while agreeing to unite with a non-episcopal Communion on the basis of the acceptance of Episcopacy for the future, might be faced with the necessity of providing for the contingency that many ministers who at the time of the union were working in the non-episcopal Communion, would remain after the union without episcopal ordination. The following suggestions appear to us to satisfy the conditions of local freedom explained above :—

(a) Ministers of both the uniting Communions should be at once recognized as of equal status in all Synods and Councils of the United Church.

(b) The terms of union should not confer on non-

¹ See Lambeth Conference 1920, Resolution 12A (iii), p. 7 *supra*.

episcopally ordained ministers the right to administer the Holy Communion to those congregations which already possess an episcopal ministry, but they should include the right to conduct other services and to preach in such churches, if licensed thereto by the Bishop.

(c) All other matters might well be left to the decision of the Provincial or General Synods of the United Church, in full confidence that these Synods will take care not to endanger that fellowship with the universal Church which is our common ultimate aim.

The Committee asks the Conference to pass a Resolution of general approval of these suggestions.

Our brethren who have the responsibility of carrying through any such negotiations may be assured of our confidence in their loyalty, and of the support of the continuing prayer and sympathy which will follow them in their venture.

II. WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER

[The World Conference on Faith and Order was originally proposed by the American Episcopal Church at its General Convention in 1910. A Joint Commission of that Church was then appointed to bring about a Conference and to invite all Christian Communions to unite in arranging for such Conference. The Joint Commission was continued by the Conventions of 1913, 1916, 1919 and 1922. A Preliminary Meeting of the World Conference was held at Geneva in August 1920 at which all the great groups of Trinitarian Churches except the Church of Rome were represented. It has been provisionally decided that the World Conference itself should be held in 1927.]

4. The Original Suggestion

(From the official 'List of Commissions Already Appointed': published by the Continuation Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order, December 20, 1922.)

A Joint Committee of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, held in Cincinnati, Ohio, in the United States of America, in October, A. D. 1910, made the following report :

'Your Committee is of one mind. We believe that the time has now arrived when representatives of the whole family of Christ, led by the Holy Spirit, may be willing to come together for the consideration of questions of Faith and Order. We believe further, that all Christian Communions are in accord with us in our desire to lay aside self-will, and to put on the mind which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. We would heed this call of the Spirit of God in all lowliness, and with singleness of purpose. We would place ourselves by the side of our fellow Christians, looking not only on our own things, but also on the things of

others, convinced that our one hope of mutual understanding is in taking personal counsel together in the spirit of love and forbearance. It is our conviction that such a Conference for the purpose of study and discussion, without power to legislate or to adopt resolutions, is the next step toward unity.

‘ With grief for our aloofness in the past, and for other faults of pride and self-sufficiency, which make for schism ; with loyalty to the truth as we see it, and with respect for the convictions of those who differ from us ; holding the belief that the beginnings of unity are to be found in the clear statement and full consideration of those things in which we differ, as well as of those things in which we are at one, we respectfully submit the following resolution :

‘ WHEREAS, There is to-day among all Christian people a growing desire for the fulfilment of our Lord’s prayer that all His disciples may be one ; that the world may believe that God has sent Him :

‘ RESOLVED, That a Joint Commission be appointed to bring about a Conference for the consideration of questions touching Faith and Order, and that all Christian Communions throughout the world which confess our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour be asked to unite with us in arranging for and conducting such a Conference. The Commission shall consist of seven Bishops, appointed by the Chairman of the House of Bishops, and seven Presbyters and seven Laymen, appointed by the President of the House of Deputies, and shall have power to add to its number and to fill any vacancies occurring before the next General Convention.’

The report was accepted joyfully by the Convention, and the resolution contained therein was adopted unanimously.

5. *Questions for Preliminary Discussion on the Part of Local Group Conferences in Preparation for the World-Wide Conference*¹

(August 1920)

Topics discussed at the Preliminary Meeting in Geneva, Switzerland, in August 1920, and proposed by that Meeting for further study and discussion throughout the World.

The Church and the nature of the reunited Church.

What is the place of the Bible and a Creed in relation to reunion ?

FIRST SERIES OF QUESTIONS

Proposed by the Subjects Committee. Concerning the Faith of the reunited Church.

1. What degree of unity in Faith will be necessary in a reunited Church ?
2. Is a statement of this one Faith in the form of a Creed necessary or desirable ?
3. If so, what Creed should be used ? or what other formulary would be desirable ?
4. What are the proper uses of a Creed and of a Confession of Faith ?

¹ These and other publications connected with the World Conference may be obtained from the General Secretary, Robert H. Gardiner, 174 Water Street, Gardiner, Maine, U.S.A.

SECOND SERIES OF QUESTIONS

Proposed by the Subjects Committee. Concerning the Ministry in the reunited Church.

1. What degree of unity in the matter of order will be necessary in a reunited Church ?
2. Is it necessary that there should be a common Ministry universally recognized ?
3. If so, of what orders or kinds of Ministers will this Ministry consist ?
4. Will the reunited Church require as necessary any conditions precedent to ordination or any particular manner of ordination ?
5. If so, what conditions precedent to ordination and what manner of ordination ought to be required ?

6. *Third Series of Questions*

Suggested by the Subjects Committee. The Church.

(September 1923)

1. How was the Church founded ? Is it in any specific sense a divine institution ?
2. What are the essential characteristics of the Church, and in particular what is the relation of the Church to Christ and to the Holy Spirit ?
3. What are the visible marks of the Church on earth ?
4. What is the relation of the Church to the Churches ?
5. What is the relation of the Church to the Kingdom of God ?

7. Statement based on the Replies to the First Series of World Conference Questions, to be submitted both to the Groups for information and consideration and to the Continuation Committee, as a possible document for use at the Conference.

[The Subjects Committee which adopted and issued this and the two following documents met at Oxford, September 10-13, 1923. It consisted of the Bishop of Bombay (Convener), the Reverend A. Martin (Principal of New College, Edinburgh), W. B. Selbie (Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford), A. Lang (Professor of Theology and Domprediger, Halle), H. S. Alivisatos (Professor of Canon Law, Athens), H. N. Bate (Canon of Carlisle).]

It being acknowledged that the Church was founded by the Will of God expressed through His Son Jesus Christ, and is maintained by the same Will, it has to be determined what on the human side is necessary to the unity and the life of the Church.

1. It is agreed that it is necessary for every member of the Church to have a hearty belief or trust in God as He has revealed Himself to men in His Son Jesus Christ, and that this revelation must be brought home to their hearts by His Holy Spirit.

2. In the historical creeds the typical phrase 'I believe in' means more than intellectual assent to a proposition or propositions; it means trust in and self-devotion to a Person whose Nature is declared by the names, attributes, and propositions which follow. For instance, 'I believe in God the Father,' does not only nor even primarily mean, 'I believe that God is the Father,' but 'I utterly trust in, and completely devote myself to God, being, as He is, the Father.' Thus those who use the historical creeds with understanding recognize in them, not compendious statements of intellectual positions, but means whereby

individuals and bodies of men may make profession of that faith which is the heart's trust in a Person.

3. At the same time that 'heart's trust' has intellectual implications. The need for setting out these implications varies with varying occasions and also with the capacities of those who make the professions.

4. Such statements of the heart's trust in God, with less or greater development of its intellectual implications, commonly take the form to which the name *creed* has been given. Creeds have been put to various uses, of which it is not necessary here to treat more than four, viz. (1) the profession of faith at baptism (baptismal or beginners' creeds), and, as connected with this, instruction before baptism or before admission to the full privileges of membership in the Church; (2) the protection of the Church against false doctrine (the creeds of the Councils or Teachers' Creeds); (3) confession of faith to God, especially in public worship; (4) confession of faith as witness before men (for this purpose longer statements such as the 'Confessions' of the Reformation Age have also been used).

5. From the earliest times some verbal expression of this faith or 'heart's trust' has been deemed to be necessary before admission to the Church. Hence arose the baptismal creeds. Attention may well be given to the experience gained from the instruction of adult converts from other religions as well as from the instruction of simple people who have been baptized in infancy. Both these forms of instruction witness to the advantage of the teaching about our Lord Jesus Christ by means of the facts of His life. This practical advantage coincides with doctrinal truth.

6. The present facts are that where a creed is used for the purposes mentioned in the preceding section, the Apostles' Creed is generally used, except by the Orthodox Church which uses the Nicene Creed, and that, where a creed is not used, instruction in the faith before, and profession of

faith at the time of, baptism or admission to the full privileges of membership in the Church follow the general lines of the Apostles' Creed, though both that instruction and that profession may, and the instruction often does, go into greater detail.

7. It is suggested that agreement might be reached that the profession of faith at Baptism should be made either by means of the Apostles' Creed or of the Nicene Creed or by acceptance of the substance of one of those creeds, according as any Church may determine.

8. Besides having a statement whereby beginners in Christ may profess their heart's trust in God, it is reasonable that the Church should also have more advanced and detailed statements for the guidance of its teachers and the avoidance of error. It will be agreed that the Holy Spirit gave the Church the best answer for each time to the actual questions of that time. These statements varied from relatively short creeds, which differed very little in length or contents from the baptismal creeds, to very long statements, sometimes called Confessions. While such statements of the belief of the Church as a teaching Church are necessary for the instruction and guidance of its teachers and for explanation of their commission to teach, the place of any one of them in relation to the whole Church depends on the relative importance of the problems with which it deals.

9. The Nicene Creed was in origin such a statement and in many parts of the Church holds at the present time a pre-eminent place, while most Churches define more fully than is done in that Creed the standard of doctrine which their teachers are commissioned to teach. It will be for the United Church to consider how it will conserve in the teaching given on its behalf the unity of doctrine which exists in it. But in the meantime it is likely to be agreed that that teaching must include, as its centre, the substance of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds.

10. At the same time it will be regarded as reasonable that different parts of the United Church should from time to time adopt or draw up more detailed statements of doctrine for the guidance of their teachers, always provided that they be in accordance with the revelation of God contained in the Holy Scriptures ; and whether they be so, or not, it will be for the United Church to decide.

11. It has been a custom in many parts of the Church to recite some form of creed in public worship. This for the individual worshipper is an act of renewal of his heart's trust in God and of thankfulness to God for the revelation of Himself which He has given. It is for the congregation a corporate act of reaffirmation of the dependence on God which makes their common worship acceptable to Him and binds them one to another. Some churches have chosen for this purpose the baptismal creed as that most generally intelligible ; others one of the fuller creeds, which when used in public worship, may be regarded as an expression of the mind of the whole Church or of the ideal to which the mind of the individual may attain.

NOTE : It should be remembered that while there is some early evidence of the use of the Creeds as ' hymns ', they were not primarily intended for recitation in public worship. However, similar dogmatic material is in free general use, for purposes of exultant or thankful corporate professions, in some of the great hymns of the Church : e. g. *Te Deum Laudamus*, *Adeste Fideles*, and Luther's hymn *Wir glauben all' an einen Gott*.

12. This recitation of the creed in public worship is a godly practice, but is not essential to the unity and the life of the Church. It is suggested that any part of the Church should be free to use either the Nicene or the Apostles' Creed, or both, in public worship, or, if to its proper authorities it seem better, not to recite a creed in public worship.

13. In regard to the use of creeds for the purpose of bearing witness before men, we may advert to the custom in the earliest times of presenting the creed of a local Church to other Churches with a view to showing that the first-named Church held the truth and agreed with the rest of Christendom. We may also mention the object which was sought to be attained by various later Confessional statements framed 'in order that the consent of the Churches might appear'. The United Church will desire to bear witness to the decisive and fundamental truths which it professes and teaches, and the World Conference, as preparing for the United Church, will be concerned to give such witness, and in this connexion will need to make some declaration of the common faith of Christendom whether by means of an ancient formula, or by means of a declaration couched in more modern terms.

14. It is suggested, further, that it is not beyond the competence of the Universal Church, when once more united, to frame another creed either for one of the above-mentioned established purposes of a creed, or for some other purpose not hitherto contemplated, always provided that such new creed be in accordance with the revelations of God recorded in Holy Scripture, and that neither the framing of the new creed nor that creed when framed bring into question the validity of the two creeds above mentioned, viz., the Nicene Creed and the Apostles' Creed, for the purposes for which and the times in which they were framed, and for use by all persons or Churches who desire to retain their use for the said purposes.

15. It is suggested, again, that it may be competent for any part of the Universal Church when united to adopt with the consent of the whole Church a new form of creed for any of the purposes above mentioned or for some purpose not hitherto contemplated.

•

8. *Resolutions of the Subjects Committee on the Agenda and Method of the World Conference*

(September 1923)

1. It was agreed that the following five subjects should be the main subjects of the Conference :

Faith.
The Church.
The Ministry.
The Sacraments.
The Christian Moral Ideal.

2. It was agreed that the order in which these subjects should be discussed should be determined later.

3. *Method.* It was agreed that a series of questions upon each of these subjects should be circulated ; that the Subjects Committee should attempt upon the basis of the answers received (and any other relevant material) to draw up a statement to which the World Conference might possibly agree. The Subjects Committee should also, if they think fit, prepare documents illustrative of the subjects to be discussed by the Conference which might be circulated to the members of the Conference beforehand.

4. *Method of discussion in the World Conference.* The statement should be the basis of discussion on each subject. The subject should first be discussed in general. When the general discussion is closed, a Motion should be made that the statement should be considered paragraph by paragraph. If this Motion should be lost, then either another statement should be submitted or the subject dropped. If the Motion should be carried, then the statement should be discussed paragraph by paragraph, and amendments might be made.

Statements of the existing opinions of the different Churches should not be asked for as part of the programme of the Conference, but the Delegates would, of course, speak from the point of view of the Churches which they represented.

5. No statement agreed to by the World Conference will have any authority except such as may be due to its intrinsic value. It will remain for each Church to determine whether it will approve and officially adopt any such statement.

9. List of Churches

Which have appointed Commissions or have otherwise signified their participation in the World Conference.

(From *The List of Commissions Already Appointed*
December 20, 1922)

ANGLICAN

Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

Church of England in Canada.

Province of the West Indies.

Church of England in Argentina.

Church of England.

Church of Ireland.

Episcopal Church in Scotland.

Nippon Sei Kokwai (Japan).

Chung Hua Sheng Kung Hui (China).

Church of England in India.

Church of the Province of South Africa.

Church of England in Australia and Tasmania.

BAPTIST

Northern Baptist Convention.
Seventh Day Baptist General Conference.
Free Baptist Conference.¹
Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland
Baptist Union of South Africa.

CHRISTIAN

American Christian Convention.

CONGREGATIONAL

National Council of Congregational Churches in the
United States.
Congregational Union of Canada.
Congregational Union of England and Wales.
Congregational Union of South Africa.
Congregational Union of Australia and New Zealand.

CZECHO-SLOVAK CHURCH

DISCIPLES

Disciples of Christ, North America.
Churches of Christ in Great Britain.
Federal Council of Churches of Christ in Australia.

EASTERN CHURCHES

Oecumenical Patriarchate, Constantinople.
Patriarchate of Alexandria.
Patriarchate of Antioch.
Patriarchate of Jerusalem.
Church of Greece.
Church of Cyprus.
Church of Bulgaria.

¹ Now represented by Northern Baptist Commission.

Church of Roumania.

Church of Serbia.

Church of Georgia.

Ukrainian Church.¹

Church of Armenia.²

Coptic Church.³

FRIENDS

Society of Friends in America.

Society of Friends in Great Britain.

LUTHERAN

Church of Norway.

Church of Sweden.

Church of Denmark.

Evangelical Lutheran Church in Hungary.

Evangelical Church (Augsburg Confession) of Slovakia.

METHODIST

Methodist Episcopal Church (North America).

Methodist Episcopal Church (South America).

African Methodist Episcopal Church (do.).

Methodist Church in Canada.

Wesleyan Methodist Conference of England, Scotland and Wales.⁴

Primitive Methodist Church, England.

United Methodist Church, England.

Wesleyan Methodist Church of South Africa.

Methodist Church of Australasia.

Methodist Church of New Zealand.

¹ Adhesion reported ; names of Commission not yet received.

² Formal action of Synod not yet reported.

³ Ibid.

⁴ By arrangement the Commission appointed by the Wesleyan Conference acts also for the Methodist Church in Ireland.

MORAVIAN

Moravian Church in Great Britain and Ireland.
Moravian Church in Germany.

OLD CATHOLIC CHURCHES

PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED

Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.
Presbyterian Church in the United States (South).
United Presbyterian Church of North America.
Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America.
Reformed Church in the United States.
Reformed Church in America.
Executive Committee of the Executive Commission of the
Alliance of Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian
System, Western or American Section.
General Presbyterian Alliance, Eastern Section.
Presbyterian Church in Canada.
Presbyterian Church of England.
Presbyterian Church in Ireland.
Church of Scotland.
United Free Church of Scotland.
Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Church
Reformierte Bund für Deutschland.
Reformed Church of Hungary.
Chiesa Evangelica Valdese.
Evangelical Church of Bohemian Brethren in Czecho-
Slovakia.
German Evangelical Church in the Czecho-Slovak Republic.
Presbyterian Church in India.
Presbyterian Church of South Africa.
Presbyterian Church of Australia in South Australia.
Presbyterian Church of New Zealand.

SOUTH INDIA UNITED CHURCH

III. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH¹

10. *Letter transmitting the Lambeth Appeal to His Holiness Pope Benedict XV together with Reply*

(May 1921)

Lambeth Palace.

S.E. 1.

3rd May 1921.

MY LORD CARDINAL,

I am directed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to send herewith to your Eminence, in order that it may be duly placed in the hands of His Holiness the Pope, a copy of the Encyclical Letter and Report recently published on behalf of the Bishops of the Anglican Communion throughout the world.

I have the honour to be,

Your Eminence's obedient servant,

G. K. A. BELL,

His Eminence,

Chaplain.

The Cardinal Secretary of State,

The Vatican, Rome.

[*Explanatory Note*]

The Archbishop of Canterbury has the honour to transmit herewith to His Holiness the Pope, with much respect, a copy of the Encyclical Letter and Report issued last Autumn by the Conference of Anglican Bishops which met at Lambeth. A copy of this document was sent immediately on the conclusion of the Conference to His Eminence Cardinal Bourne as the chief representative in England of

¹ For an account of certain conversations between Roman Catholic and Anglican divines under the presidency of Cardinal Mercier at Malines, see the Archbishop of Canterbury's *Letter to the Archbishops and Metropolitans of the Anglican Communion*, p. 338.

the Roman Catholic Church. In accordance, however, with the wish expressed by many Bishops and others the Archbishop of Canterbury has the honour to enclose a copy to His Holiness the Pope, together with a Latin version of the Appeal to All Christian People which forms an important part of the Resolutions of the Conference, and which is obviously of interest and importance to the authorities of the Church of Christ throughout the world.

Lambeth Palace, S.E. 1.

3rd May 1921.

[REPLY]

Rome, 21 May 1921.

Segretario Di Stato,
Di Sua Santità.

The Cardinal Secretary of State presents his compliments to the Rev. G. K. A. Bell, and begs him to thank the Archbishop of Canterbury for his courtesy in sending a copy of the Encyclical Letter and Report of the Lambeth Conference which the Cardinal Secretary of State has had the honour of presenting to the Holy Father.

Rev. G. K. A. Bell, Chaplain.

II. Extract from Encyclical Letter of His Holiness Pope Pius XI (Ubi Arcano Dei)

TO THE PATRIARCHS, PRIMATES, ARCHBISHOPS, BISHOPS,
AND OTHER ORDINARIES IN PEACE AND COMMUNION WITH
THE HOLY SEE ON THE PEACE OF CHRIST TO BE SOUGHT
IN THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST

(December 23, 1922)

RELIGIOUS UNION

From this Apostolic centre of the fold of Christ Our look turns next to the many who, either not knowing Christ or not fully holding His teaching or the unity

established by Him, are still outside the fold, though destined for it by Divine Providence. The Vicar of the Divine Shepherd cannot but repeat and make his own the words which, with their simple brevity, are redolent of love and tender pity : ' Them also [the other sheep] must I bring,' and must rejoice, too, in the happy prophecy of Christ Himself : ' And they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd ' (John x, 16).

• May God soon bring it to pass, as We and all of you and all the faithful earnestly pray, that that consummation may bring the fulfilment of the tender and assured prophecy of the Divine Heart.

And there has been seen what may be regarded as good augury for this religious unity : a thing of which you, Venerable Brethren, are well aware, generally unexpected indeed and perhaps to some a source of no special joy, but surely bringing pleasure to Us and to you—the fact, that is, that the representatives and rulers of almost all the States of the world, as if moved by a common instinct and desire of peace, have turned to this Apostolic See either to resume old friendly relations or to inaugurate such relations of concord. And this gives Us pleasure, not only on account of the increased authority of the Church, but also on account of the greater glory of its beneficence and the experience given to all of its inestimable virtues—which it, the Church of God, alone possesses—in bringing to human society all prosperity, including civil earthly well-being. For if indeed its direct object is, by Divine command, spiritual and eternal blessings, still, by the close connexion of things, it helps the earthly prosperity of individuals and society as well as if it was instituted for no other end.

• And if the Church does not think it right to interfere without just reason in such earthly and purely political affairs, still, with full right, it cannot tolerate that the political power shall take excuse therefrom either to oppose

the good of the higher order, on which depends the salvation of souls, or to harass it by unjust laws or decrees, or to violate the Divine constitution of the Church itself, or to trample on the laws of God Himself among civil society.

*12. Encyclical Letter (Ecclesiam Dei) of His
Holiness Pope Pius XI*

TO HIS VENERABLE BRETHREN, THE PATRIARCHS, PRIMATES, ARCHBISHOPS, BISHOPS, AND OTHER ORDINARIES OF PLACES HAVING PEACE AND COMMUNION WITH THE HOLY SEE. ON THE 300TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. JOSAPHAT THE MARTYR, ARCHBISHOP OF POLOCK (OF THE ORIENTAL RITE)

(November 12, 1923)

Venerable Brethren—

Greeting and the Apostolic Benediction !

The Church of God, which has been so constituted by His marvellous counsel that in the fullness of time it might, like a vast family, embrace the whole human race, we know to be divinely distinguished by one note above all others which adorn it, the note of oecumenical unity. For Christ the Lord did not only entrust to the Apostles alone that office, which He had Himself received from the Father when He said ' All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations ' ;¹ but He also willed that the Apostolic college should be perfectly one, knit together by the closest of bonds in a two-fold manner, within, by the same faith and the love ' which is shed abroad in our hearts . . . by the Holy Spirit ',² and without, by the rule of one over all, seeing that He bestowed upon Peter the office of chief (*principatum*) of the Apostles, as it were a perpetual beginning (*principium*) and visible foundation of unity. This unity at the very close of His earthly life He did most earnestly commend to them.³ It was this

¹ Matt. xxviii. 18, 19.

² Rom. v. 5.

³ John xvii. 11, 21, 22.

too that He desired¹ of the Father with insistent prayer and obtained from Him, being 'heard for His godly fear'.²

So then the Church grew together and increased as 'one body', a body living and growing by one spirit. Her head indeed is 'Christ from whom the whole body is compacted and joined together by that which every joint supplieth'.³ But for that very reason her visible head is he who acts as Christ's representative on earth, the Roman Pontiff. On him, as the successor of Peter, falls in perpetual succession that utterance of Christ 'On this Rock will I build my Church';⁴ and he, ever fulfilling that vicarious office, which was bestowed upon Peter, ceases not to stablish his brethren, when need arises, and to feed both the lambs and the sheep of the Lord's flock (*gregis*).

Now there is nothing which 'the Enemy' has ever attacked with such bitterness as this unity of Rule in the Church, by which 'the unity of the spirit' is joined together 'in the bond of peace'.⁵ And although he has failed utterly to prevail against the Church herself, he has yet succeeded in rending not a few of her sons and even whole peoples from her bosom and embrace. Many things have helped to bring this about, such as the strife of nation with nation, the passing of laws alien to piety and religion, or too covetous desires for transitory advantages.

But gravest and most grievous of all was the withdrawal of the Byzantines from oecumenical unity. And although the Councils of Lyons and of Florence seemed indeed to heal this wound, yet later it broke out afresh and to-day continues unhealed, to the great injury of souls. As a result we see many led astray to their utter ruin, and especially the Oriental Slavs, although these indeed continued longer than the rest in the bosom of the Church which is their Mother. For it is well known that they maintained

¹ Ibid.

² Heb. v. 7.

³ Eph. iv. 4, 5, 15, 16.

⁴ Matt. xvi. 18.

⁵ Eph. iv. 3.

some sort of relation with this Apostolic See even after the schism of Michael Caerularius, and that though their intercourse was interrupted by the invasions first of the Tartars and then of the Mongols, it was subsequently renewed and continued so long as they were not prevented by the stubbornness of powerful men.

Nor indeed in this behalf have the Roman Pontiffs neglected any step which lay in their power, and divers of them have displayed a singular zeal and interest in the salvation of the Oriental Slavs. Such for example was Gregory VII, who when the Prince of Kiev 'Demetrius, King of the Russians, and the Queen, his wife,' began to reign, at the request of their son at Rome, wrote them a letter full of friendship in which he prayed to God to give them all things that were good.¹ Thus again Honorius III sent legates to the people of Novgorod: as did also Gregory IX, and a little later Innocent IV who appointed the high-minded and valiant John de Plano Carpino, an illustrious son of the Franciscan family, as his legate. The fruit of the care taken in these ways by our Predecessors was seen in the year 1255, when unity and concord were restored, and in celebration of this reconciliation in the name and by the authority of Alexander IV the abbot Opizo, the legate of that Pontiff, conferred the insignia of royalty with solemn ceremonies upon Daniel, the son of Romanus. And so according to the venerable tradition and custom of the older Oriental Slavs, it came to pass that Isidore, Metropolitan of Kiev and Moscow, and Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church, at the Council of Florence gave a solemn undertaking in the words of his own countrymen that he would preserve Catholic unity in the faith of the Apostolic See, in holiness and inviolability.

The reunion (*coniunctio*) of Kiev and the Holy See lasted

¹ *Ep.*, lib. 2, op. 74, apud Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, t. 148, col. 425.

for many years. Its disruption was produced by disturbances which took place in public affairs at the opening of the sixteenth century. It was, however, once more happily renewed at the Conventus of Brest, by the initiative and agency of the Metropolitan of Kiev and other Bishops of the Ruthenians. Clement VIII welcomed them in most loving fashion, and in the Constitution *Magnus Dominus*, which he issued, summoned all the faithful of Christ to render thanks to God 'whose thoughts are always thoughts of peace and who wills that all men should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth'.

Moreover that this unity and agreement might for ever continue the All-seeing God consecrated it, as it were with a seal of holiness and martyrdom. This great honour fell to the lot of Josaphat, Archbishop of Polock, according to the Slavonic Oriental rite, whom we acknowledge rightly as alike the glory and pillar of the Oriental Slavs; and assuredly there is hardly any member of that Church who has shed more distinction upon their name, or promoted their welfare more earnestly than this man who is both their Pastor and Apostle, especially since he poured out his own blood for the sake of the unity of Holy Church. On the occasion of the 300th anniversary of this most glorious martyrdom, it is Our high pleasure to recall the memory of his greatness once again, in order that the Lord being entreated by more earnest prayers of good men 'may stir up in His Church the spirit in the strength of which the blessed Josaphat, Martyr and Bishop, laid down his life for the sheep':¹ and that the work to which he gave himself so ardently may be carried forward with ever greater and more general zeal for the cause of unity, until that which was at once the promise of Christ and the desire of all the Saints shall be fulfilled: 'And there shall be one fold (*ovile*) and one Shepherd'.²

¹ In officio S. Josaphat.

² John x. 16.

He was born of parents who were not Uniats, but being rightfully baptized and having received the name of John he devoted himself to godliness from his tenderest years. As he followed the splendours of the Slavonic liturgy, he sought truth and the glory of God before all things, and on that account and not on the impulse of any human reasonings he attached himself while still a young boy to the communion of the one Oecumenical or Catholic Church. And he judged that he was destined for her communion from the very fact that his baptism had been duly received. Moreover, feeling himself moved by some heavenly instinct to the task of restoring holy unity throughout the world, he saw that he could assist most powerfully to such an end if he retained the Oriental Slavonic Rite and the Monastic Rule of St. Basil within the unity of the Universal Church. In the year 1604 he accordingly received admission among the monks who are disciples of St. Basil, and receiving the name of Josaphat in place of the name of John, he devoted himself wholly to the practice of all the virtues, especially of piety and asceticism. The love for the Cross which he had conceived in the days of his tenderest childhood, by gazing upon the image of the Crucified, he ever displayed in a quite singular degree.

The Metropolitan of Kiev, John Velamin Rutsky, who was archimandrite in charge of this monastery, bears witness that Josaphat in a short while made such progress in the monastic life, that he was able to be the master of the others who were with him. When he had been advanced to the priesthood Josaphat was himself appointed archimandrite and set over the monastery. In the administration of this office he not only made it his aim to keep the monastery and its adjacent church safe from harm, and to strengthen them against the attacks of enemies, but seeing that they were almost deserted by the faithful he took special pains to persuade the Christian laity, once more

to flock to the precincts. But all the time, as the union of his own countrymen with the See of Peter was his chief care, he continued to seek everywhere for the kind of arguments which would promote or strengthen such union, and in particular he thoroughly studied the liturgical books which the Oriental Christians and even the separated Christians had been accustomed to use, in accordance with the ordinances of the holy Fathers.

Thus after making all this careful preparation, Josaphat began the task of restoring unity with such vigour and such sweetness and also with such success that his enemies called him 'the Ravisher of Souls'. It is certainly marvellous to think how many he led to the one fold of Jesus Christ, men of every rank and calling, common people, merchants, knights, even governors and rulers of provinces, as is recorded of Sokolinski of Plock, Tyszkiewicz of Novgorod, and Mieleczko of Smolensk. Indeed he extended his apostolate into a still wider field from the time of his appointment as Archbishop of the Church of Polock. Incredible must the vigour of this apostolate have been, when we recall the many instances it exhibited, of extraordinary chastity, extraordinary poverty, extraordinary abstinence, or his great generosity to the poor which led him even to pawn his omophorion to relieve their necessity; and when we also remember how strictly he kept himself to the paths of religion, and did not mix in political affairs, though he was urged often and earnestly to take part in the troubles and factions of the State; above all when we recollect the unwearying devotion with which the holy Bishop applied himself to the imparting of truth both by speech and by writing. Many were the works which he published in a style specially suited for the understanding of the people: such as his books on *The Primacy of St. Peter*, *The Baptism of St. Vladimir*, *The Defence of Catholic Unity*, *A Catechism according to the method of Blessed Peter*

Canisius and other works of that character. Again by the constant trouble he took in urging both grades of the clergy to a diligent performance of their duties, he aroused men's enthusiasm for the priestly office and gradually led the people, duly instructed in Christian doctrine and nourished by the careful preaching of the Word of God, to come more and more frequently to the Sacraments and the Sacred Liturgy, and to fashion their lives after a better and more godly discipline. Thus the Spirit of God was shed abroad far and wide, and Josaphat nobly confirmed the work of unity to which he had dedicated himself. But he confirmed it most of all, and in fact consecrated it, when freely, willingly, and with a dauntless spirit he died a martyr's death for its sake. Martyrdom was ever in his mind, often on his lips: in a famous speech he proclaimed his desire for martyrdom; finally he begged God to grant him martyrdom as His special boon. And a few days before his death, when he was warned of the plots prepared against him he prayed to God saying 'Lord, grant that I may have strength to shed my blood for the unity and obedience of the Apostolic See'. His prayer was fulfilled on Sunday, November 12, 1623, when calmly and cheerfully he met the encircling throng of enemies who were hunting down the Apostle of Unity, asking them, after the example of his Master and Lord, not to hurt his household, and delivered himself to their hands, and while the cruel blows fell upon him and he was being done to death he ceased not, even with his latest breath, to plead with God that He would forgive his murderers.

Great were the rewards of so famous a martyrdom; and in particular a great increase of power and strength came to the Ruthenian Bishops, who two months later wrote a letter to the Sacred Council for the Propagation of the Faith, in which they proclaimed 'We, too, offer ourselves as very ready to shed our blood for the Catholic faith in like

manner as one among us has already shed his blood.' Besides this a vast number of men, including the murderers of the Martyr, were afterwards received into the bosom of the one Church.

Therefore the blood of St. Josaphat, as it was 300 years ago, so it is more than ever to-day the pledge of peace and the seal of unity. To-day, We say, when We see how the mad havoc of savage wars has stained with so much fraternal slaughter the unhappy territories of the Slav races, distracted with discord and revolution. Indeed We seem as it were to hear the blood of Josaphat 'speaking better things than that of Abel',¹ and addressing his Slav brethren as of old in the words of Christ Jesus 'They are as sheep without a shepherd. I have compassion on the multitude'. And in truth how miserable is their state! How great are their hardships! How many are the exiles from their country! What destruction of men's bodies do We behold! What ruin of men's minds! As We survey the present condition of the Slavs, far more pitiable than the condition which filled Josaphat's heart with sorrow, in Our paternal love We can scarce refrain from tears.

Indeed in Our desire to relieve so great a burden of misfortune, We have striven to bring help to the hapless sufferers, having no human goal in view and making no distinction between the victims of want, only asking that Our aid might be bestowed where the necessity was greatest. And so grave was the need that Our resources have proved insufficient to meet it. Nor have We been able to prevent the heaping of insults on truth and virtue, in contempt for all religion, and, in several places, the haling of Christian men and priests and bishops to prison and even to death.

As We contemplate these calamities We take no little comfort to Ourselves in the thought that the solemn commemoration of the most famous Bishop of the Slavs

¹ Heb. xii. 24.

offers Us a very fitting opportunity for showing the fatherly mind with which We regard all Oriental Slavs, and of setting before them that perfection of all good things which is to be found in the Oecumenical unity of the Holy Church.

Towards this unity We entreat all those who are separated from Us to turn, but We desire especially to exhort all the Faithful of Christ to take Josaphat as their leader, and to do everything in their power to support and help Us. Let them understand that this unity is to be sought not by controversy or contention so much as by the example and offices of a holy life, and in particular by love towards their Slav brethren and all other Oriental Christians, according to the bidding of the Apostle ' That ye be like-minded, having the same love, being of one accord, of one mind. Let nothing be done through strife or vain glory : but in lowliness of mind let each esteem other better than themselves. Look not every man on his own things but every man also on the things of others ' .¹

Wherefore, just as it is fitting that the Christians of the East who are separated from us should lay aside their ancient prejudices, and take pains to understand the true life of the Church, and not blame the Church of Rome for the faults of individuals, faults which the Church herself both condemns and strives to correct, so also should those who are Latins understand the manners and customs of the East with greater fullness and thoroughness, for it was to a peculiar understanding of their customs that the work of St. Josaphat owed its rich results.

With these considerations in mind, We have been at pains to give renewed support to the Pontifical Oriental Institute, founded by Our deeply lamented predecessor Benedict XV ; as We are persuaded that it is from a right understanding of the facts that men come to a right judgement and reach

¹ Phil. ii. 2-4.

that genuine goodwill which, when joined with love, is able, by God's blessing, to serve the cause of religious unity more than anything else.

For in truth when filled with this love all will feel as the inspired Apostle Paul teaches, 'For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek ; for the same Lord is Lord of all, and is rich unto all that call upon him.' ¹ And again, and more than this, in devout obedience to the teaching of the same Apostle, they will banish and put away not only prejudices but also idle suspicions, enmities, hatreds, and in a word all those motions of men's minds which are alien to Christian love, and by which nations are divided one against another. For thus says the same Paul : ' Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds : and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him ; where there is neither Greek nor Jew, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but Christ is all, and in all.' ²

The reconciliation alike of individuals and peoples being thus made perfect, the reunion of the Church will be perfected at the same time, as all those who have been separated from her for any cause return to her bosom. The perfecting of reunion will not be brought about by any human contrivance but by the goodness of God alone, who ' is no respecter of persons ' ³ and who ' makes no distinction between us and them ' ,⁴ but it will come to pass that all peoples will be reunited and enjoy an equal right, of whatever race or language they be, and whatever be the sacred rites they follow, rites which the Roman Church has always most piously revered and retained, and has decreed that they should always be retained, decking herself with them as it were with precious garments, like ' a queen in a vesture of gold, wrought about with divers colours ' .⁵

¹ Rom. x. 12.

² Col. iii. 9-11.

³ Acts x. 34.

⁴ Acts xv. 9.

⁵ Ps. xlv. 10.

Moreover as this agreement of all peoples in oecumenical unity, being first of all the work of God, is to be won by the divine aid and the divine succour, so it is for us to be diligent and constant in supplication, following the example and pattern of St. Josaphat himself, who in his work for unity relied chiefly on the virtue of prayer.

And again following his guidance and leadership, let us pay very special devotion to the august Sacrament of the Eucharist, the pledge and principal cause of unity, that mystery of the faith, the love and zealous use of which the Oriental Slavs have preserved even in their forsaking of the Roman Church and have so escaped the impiety of the graver heresies. Wherefore we may be allowed to hope that, in the words of the prayer which our Mother the Church offers up with devotion and faith in the celebration of the same mysteries, ' the God of peace and unity of His mercy may grant us the gifts which are mystically signified in these offerings ' ;¹ seeing that both Latins and Orientals, with united prayers, ask for that very thing in the midst of the Holy Sacrifice ; the latter ' calling upon the Lord for the unity of all ' , the former beseeching the Lord Jesus Christ that he would ' regard the faith of His Church and grant her that peace and unity which is agreeable to His will ' .

A further bond of unity and reconciliation with the Oriental Slavs is found in their singular zeal and devotion for the great Virgin Mother of God, a bond which separates them from very many heretics and brings them nearer to ourselves. Josaphat not only specially excelled in this devotion but also trusted greatly to it in the work of drawing men to unity. For this reason he was accustomed to carry with him, after the manner of Orientals, a little ikon of the Virgo Deipara, who is most devoutly worshipped by the monks of St. Basil, and in Rome itself at the churches

¹ *Secreta Missae in solemnitate Corporis Christi.*

of SS. Sergius and Bacchus by Christians of every rite, as 'Queen of Pastures'. Let us therefore invoke our most gracious Mother by this title especially, that she may lead our separated brethren back to the health-giving pastures, where Peter, never failing in his successors, the vicar of the Eternal Shepherd, feeds and rules over all, both the lambs and the sheep of the Christian flock.

Finally, let us call to our aid all the Inhabitants of Heaven as advocates in so great a matter, and those especially who in old days enjoyed a reputation for holiness or wisdom among the Orientals, and to-day enjoy great veneration and observance among their peoples. But first of all let us ask for the help of the prayers of Josaphat, who fought so valiantly for the cause of unity when he was alive, that he may still plead that cause with God and be its most powerful champion. And We Ourselves entreat him in the humble words of Our predecessor Pius IX of immortal memory: 'O Holy Josaphat, would that thy blood which thou didst shed for the Church of Christ may be a pledge of that union with this Holy Apostolic See, for which thou didst ever long, and which thou didst beseech the Good and Mighty God to grant, crying to Him night and day with supplications and prayers. And in order that this may at length come to pass, we call upon thee to succour us with thy prayers in heaven at the throne of God.'

In earnest of the divine favour, and in witness of Our goodwill, and with heartfelt love, to you, Venerable Brethren, and your clergy and people We impart most lovingly Our Apostolic Benediction.

Given at St. Peter's, Rome, on the 12th day of November in the year 1923, the second of Our Pontificate.

PIUS PP. XI.

IV. THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH

13. *Encyclical Letter from the Patriarchate of Constantinople*

UNTO ALL THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST WHERESOEVER

THEY BE

(January 1920)

'See that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently.'
(1 Pet. i. 22.)

Our Church is of opinion that a closer intercourse with each other and a mutual understanding between the several Christian Churches is not prevented by the doctrinal differences existing between them, and that such an understanding is highly desirable and necessary, and in many ways useful in the well-conceived interest of each one of the Churches taken apart and as a whole Christian body, as also for preparing and facilitating the complete and blessed union which may some day be attained with God's help. Our Church, therefore, deems the present time most opportune for bringing forth and considering this important question in common. For although, owing to old prejudices, traditions, and even pretensions, it is probable that there may even now arise or be brought forward the same difficulties which have so often frustrated the work of union, nevertheless, seeing that it is now a question of a mere contact and understanding, the difficulties, in our mind, will in any case be less serious, and if there be a good will and disposition, neither can they nor should they constitute an invincible and insuperable obstacle.

We therefore, on the establishment of the League of Nations, which has now been effected with good omen,

consider the matter to be both feasible and more than ever timely, and we beg, full of hope, herein to state summarily our thoughts and opinions as to the way in which we conceive this intercourse and understanding, and how we consider it possible, and we earnestly seek and invite the judgement and opinion thereon both of the other brothers in the East and of the venerable Christians of the Churches in the West wheresoever they be.

We accordingly think that the following two things can most greatly contribute to the attainment of such a desirable and useful intercourse, and to its accomplishment and public manifestation :

And first of all we deem as necessary and indispensable the removal of all mutual distrust and friction between the various Churches caused by the tendency, to be seen among some of them, to entice and convert followers of other confessions. For no one ignores what is taking place, unfortunately, even now disturbing the internal peace of the Churches, and especially those in the East, on which new afflictions and trials are thus brought through their own co-religionists ; and how great, as compared with the trifling results obtained, is the hatred and antagonism produced by this tendency on the part of some to proselytize and entice the followers of other Christian confessions. And that sincerity and, above all, confidence may be restored between the Churches, we consider it as most important that love between the Churches should be revived and strengthened, so that they may no longer look upon each other as strangers and enemies, but as relatives and friends in Christ, as ' fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel ' (Eph. iii. 6). And when the several Churches are inspired by love, and place it before everything else, in their judgement of the others and in relation to one another, they will then be able, instead of increasing

and widening the existing dissensions, to lessen and diminish the same as far as possible ; and by promoting a constant brotherly interest in the condition, the stability, and the prosperity of other Churches, by their eagerness in watching what is happening in those Churches, and by obtaining a more accurate knowledge of them, and by their readiness to give help and assistance, whenever occasion arises, they will do and achieve many good things to the glory and profit both of themselves and of the whole Christian body, and will advance the matter of the union.

And this friendship and kindly disposition toward each other can, to our mind, be demonstrated and more especially proved in the following manner :

(a) By acceptance of a uniform calendar for a simultaneous celebration of all the great Christian feasts by all the Churches ; (b) by the exchange of brotherly letters on the great feasts of the ecclesiastical year, when it is customary so to do, and on other exceptional occasions ; (c) by a more friendly intercourse between the representatives of the various Churches wherever they be ; (d) by an intercourse between theological schools and the representatives of theological science ; and by the exchange of theological and ecclesiastical periodicals and works published in each Church ; (e) by the exchange of students between the seminaries of the different Churches ; (f) by convening pan-Christian conferences to examine questions of common interest to all Churches ; (g) by the impartial and more historical examination of doctrinal differences, both from the chair and in theological treatises ; (h) by mutually respecting the customs and usages prevailing in each Church ; (i) by allowing to each other the use of places of prayer and of cemeteries for the funeral and burial of persons belonging to other confessions dying in foreign lands ; (j) by the settlement of the question of mixed marriages between the various confessions ; (k) and,

finally, by the mutual support of the Churches in the work of strengthening religious relief, of charity, and the like.

Such a frank and vivid intercourse between the Churches will be all the more beneficial to the whole body of the Church, as many dangers threaten no longer any particular Church, but all of them generally, because these dangers attack the very foundation of the Christian faith and the very composition of Christian life and society. For the terrible World War which has just come to an end, as it has brought to light many unhealthy things in the life of Christian Nations, and revealed in many cases a great absence of respect for the very principle of justice and humanity, so, too, it has not only made old wounds worse, but, so to speak, opened new ones of a more practical character, and with regard to which great attention and care is naturally needed on the part of all Churches. The daily advance of alcoholism ; the increase of superfluous luxury under the pretext of rendering life more beautiful and more enjoyable ; the voluptuousness and lust hardly covered by the cloak of freedom and emancipation of the flesh ; the prevailing unchecked licentious indecency in literature, painting, the theatre, and in music, bearing the respectable name of development of good taste and cultivation of fine art ; the deification of wealth and the contempt of higher ideals ; all these and the like, as they produce serious dangers to the constitution of Christian societies, are questions of the day, requiring and calling for a common study and co-operation on the part of the Christian Churches.

Finally, it is the duty of the Churches which adorn themselves with the sacred name of Christ not to forget and neglect any longer His new and great commandment of love, and still to fall piteously behind the political authorities, who, truly applying the spirit of the Gospel and of the Justice of Christ, have under happy auspices already instituted the League of Nations, for the defence of right

and for the cultivation of love and harmony among the nations.

For all these reasons, hoping that the other Churches would share our thoughts and opinions as above stated on the need of promoting such a co-operation and intercourse between the Churches, at least as a beginning, we request each one of them to make known to us its thoughts and opinions thereon in reply, so that after defining the goal by common consent and agreement, we may safely proceed together to its realization, and thus 'speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ; from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love.'—(Eph. iv. 15, 16).

At the Patriarchate of Constantinople in the month of January in the year of Grace one thousand nine hundred and twenty.

The Locum Tenens of the Patriarchal Oecumenical Throne : Metropolitan of Brussa : DOROTHEUS.

The Metropolitan of Caesaria : NICOLAUS.

„ „ „ Cyzicus : CONSTANTINUS.

„ „ „ Amassia : GERMANUS.

„ „ „ Pissidia : GERASSIMUS.

„ „ „ Angyra : GERVASIUS.

„ „ „ Aenos : JOACHIM.

„ „ „ Vizya : ANTHIMUS.

„ „ „ Silivris : EUGENIUS.

„ „ „ Saranta Ecclesias :

AGATHANGFLUS.

„ „ „ Tyroloe and Serentium :

CHRYSOStOM

„ „ „ Dardanelles and Lampsacos :

EIRENAEUS.

14. *Proposed Concordat*

TERMS OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN EASTERN ORTHODOX, OLD CATHOLIC AND ANGLICAN CHURCHES, PROPOSED AS BASIS OF RESTORATION OF CORPORATE UNITY AND INTER- COMMUNION

(1920)

[This 'Proposed Concordat' was drawn up in 1920 by the Commission of the American Episcopal Church appointed 'to confer with Eastern Orthodox and Old Catholic Churches', and is intended to prepare a *basis* for future negotiations. It was presented by a Deputation of the Commission which visited Europe in the summer of 1920 to (1) the Old Catholic Bishop of Switzerland (Bishop Herzog) who 'with the approval of his National Council endorsed and signed' it; (2) the Metropolitan (Mgr. Meletios) and Governing Synod of Greece, who endorsed the proposal as 'very satisfactory'; (3) the Locum Tenens of the Patriarchal Throne (Mgr. Dorotheos) and the Holy Governing Synod of Constantinople who 'approved and unreservedly accepted the proposed Concordat, sealing it with the Great Seal of the Patriarchate'; (4) the Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople (Mgr. Zaven). The Letter from the Locum Tenens to Bishop Darlington, chairman of the Commission, declaring approval, immediately follows. See *Report to the General Convention 1922* of the American Episcopal Church of the Joint Commission to confer with the authorities of the Eastern Orthodox and Catholic Churches.]

In general, we accept with common mind the traditional and oecumenically received Faith, Ministry, and Sacramental Order of the historic Catholic Church; acknowledging, however, that—subject to the requirement that these vital things should be carefully preserved and administered, without alteration or compromise—each particular autonomous part of the Catholic Church has authority to regulate its own internal government, ritual,

and spiritual discipline in adjustment to its peculiar racial, national, and modern conditions and circumstances.

In particular—

(a) We accept the authority of the Catholic Church over all the faithful to teach what is necessary to be believed and practised for salvation, and to enforce by spiritual means such holy discipline as may be required for the protection of the Church's Faith and Order, and for the guidance of souls in the way of eternal life.

(b) We accept the canonical Scriptures as being the veritable Word of God, as given for the upbuilding of believers in the Faith which they have received from Christ through His Church, and as confirming and illustrating all doctrine and practice which is generally necessary to be believed and fulfilled for salvation. In controversies as to the meaning of Holy Scripture, we accept the Catholic Faith as affording a true Summary of the fundamental and divinely inspired teaching which is progressively unfolded in the successive parts of the Bible.

(c) We accept the Nicene Creed, the decrees of faith put forth by the oecumenically accepted General Councils, and the sacraments as means of grace.

In accordance with the preceding agreements we do solemnly declare our acceptance of the sacramental acts each of the other, and that they are true and valid. And, holding fast the truth once delivered to the Saints, we pronounce that intercommunion is desirable and authorized for all our members wherever and whenever it is deemed convenient and practicable by the proper local ecclesiastical authorities.

15. *Proposed Concordat*

LETTER FROM THE LOCUM TENENS OF THE OECUMENICAL PATRIARCHATE

Patriarcat Œcuménique, Constantinople, 13/26 June 1920

To the Rt. Rev. James Henry Darlington, Bishop of Harrisburg, our beloved brother in Christ, grace and peace from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ.

It is with pleasure that our Holy Synod received the proposal which Your Lordship brought and communicated to us on behalf of Your Church of a closer rapprochement between the Anglican, Old Catholic Churches and the Eastern Orthodox Church by the formation and introduction of bonds of confederation between them.

This proposal has been heard with the more attention and readiness by us as it fully coincides with a very similar proposal, which a short time ago our Church, inspired by the same Christian spirit of love and peace, addressed to the Churches of Christ everywhere, suggesting the arrangement of some regular form of contact and intercommunion between them, according to the example of the League of Nations.

Therefore we beg to state, by decision of the Holy Synod, that we accept the said proposal with willingness and readily concede to it.

We shall be deeply gratified if it is realized by the benediction of God, and if this should lead to the establishment of a desirable regular contact between the Churches of Christ. By these means the task of full and holy union may make more certain and rapid progress, and the strengthening of the spirit of Christian love and solidarity amongst Christian churches and peoples shall be greatly helped. May God the Master bless all your efforts tending to that end and grant to your beloved Lordship health and strength for many years.

The Locum Tenens of the Oecumenical Patriarchate.

16. *Report of the Delegation of the Patriarchate sent to the Conference at Lambeth*

[Mgr. Philaretos, Metropolitan of Demotica, Professor Komninos of Halki, the Archimandrite Pagonis of London, and the Archpriest Callinicos of Manchester, visited London in July 1920, as a special Delegation from the Oecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. It was the result of a formal invitation from the Archbishop of Canterbury, and was 'for purposes of consultation with Bishops attending the Lambeth Conference on relations between the Orthodox and Anglican communions'. See Resolution 18 of the Lambeth Conference 1920 (p. 9 *supra*). The Delegation on return to Constantinople presented the following Report to the Holy Synod (see *The Christian East*, March 1922). It should be noted that a careful study on 'Anglican Ordinations' was also prepared by Professor Komninos and published at Constantinople in 1921 (trans. *The Christian East*, September 1921).]

(Constantinople 1920)

MOST REVEREND AND HOLY SYNOD,

We, the undersigned, the Delegates of the 'Great Church', and the other members of the Patriarchal Mission, having fulfilled, so far as circumstances permitted, the duty which you laid upon us, thus present briefly our report of the transactions . . .

(After some personal expressions of gratitude to the Archbishop of Canterbury and others who showed hospitality to the Delegation, the Report proceeds)

Our first and most important task, in conformity with the object of our Mission, was to represent the Oecumenical Patriarchate at the Pan-Anglican Conference of Lambeth. In conformity with the character of this Conference it was natural that after our official presentation to it our contact and association with it should be limited to co-operation with its special Committee, which was to examine the questions regarding the relation of the Church of England to our Church, and at the same time with the Committee which in accordance with the Resolution of the preceding Lambeth Conference was appointed as the Standing

Committee set apart to deal with the affairs of the Eastern Church, and to which accordingly every relevant question was referred for consideration and decision.

This Committee, presided over by one of the most distinguished English theologians, Dr. Gore, formerly Bishop of Oxford, includes a number of sub-committees, of which only a particular one acted on each occasion.

With each of these Committees we sat repeatedly, exchanging views and opinions of which the purport is set forth below.

Especially with the Standing Committee, which by reason of its character was the more important, we laid the basis of that future co-operation which is indispensable for so great a task.

The time which was left to us from these meetings and certain preparations for them, in which we agreed upon the answers, given usually by the Bishop of Demotica, we thought that we ought to utilize in becoming better acquainted with the ecclesiastical life of the English, that we might be better able to estimate persons and things. To this end we obtained most zealous assistance from one of the members of the Standing Committee, the Rev. J. A. Douglas, and especially from its Secretary, the Rev. H. J. Fynes-Clinton, and from the noble and devout Mr. Athelstan Riley. So it was made possible for us to visit various Churches, Colleges and Monasteries, receiving everywhere a friendly reception and no ordinary honour. The Bishop of Demotica spoke fitting words at each place, and pious churchmen and clergy received the Episcopal blessing gladly and with great reverence. In these visits we found that the Anglican churches have begun by degrees, in some places at least, to wear the ancient vestments and to observe the ecclesiastical ceremonies and festivals with the glory and dignity handed down from ancient times. Worthy of special notice is the constantly increasing development of the monastic life, following practical aims of public usefulness, such as missions to

those who have not heard the name of Christ, the formation of penitentiaries and rescue work among women, and so forth. In ecclesiastical establishments and those of a different nature England, as is known, is abundantly fortunate and we had the opportunity of seeing some of them in an intimate way. So we pass to the questions regarding the work done with the above mentioned Committees. Special mention and thanks are due to Mr. Chrusaki, the excellent interpreter.

At the first meeting with the Standing Committee and with the Bishops of the Lambeth Conference much pleasure and gratitude were expressed by the English for our Mission, and much sympathy in all that was then happening regarding Thrace and Asia Minor. To the expression of such feelings we made suitable answer. Afterwards began the discussions dealing with the questions with which the Committee from Athens and the respective Committees from Serbia and Roumania were also occupied, and also with regard to many other questions and subjects. Although from the papers issued by our own people we had knowledge of the discussions with the Committee from Athens, we thought it right that before any discussion took place the proceedings relating thereto should be read, as also those with the Serbian and Roumanian Committees. Such reading would limit the discussions within certain boundaries, and would make us better acquainted with the answers made by our people and by Orthodox foreigners, which we ought to bear in mind, in the interest of the details, and of the general aim pursued by us. The spirit of love and peace, and the respect which our Church always shows towards those of our own blood and towards the other Orthodox Churches of our own Faith, were vividly before our conscience.

Thus from the reading of the proceedings, relevant to the discussions with the Committee from Athens, the questions discussed with it and the views interchanged, arose the subjects of Baptism, Chrism, the Eucharist, and also the matters relating to the Seventh Oecumenical Council.

The discussions of this Committee with the English Bishops were, as is known, closely related to those with the American Bishops. There was discussion concerning Baptism, Chrism, and the Eucharist at the meetings of the Anglicans with the Serbians and Roumanians and also regarding Anglican Ordinations and certain canonical points regarding marriage. It was natural that, in the discussion with us, matters referring to the above questions should be among the first brought forward, as they interest the Anglicans most of all the points regarding their relation to us. Of these questions the following more or less important points were discussed regarding the distinction and difference between us and them, questions being asked of us and explanations sought, which contributed much to their forming a more accurate and at the same time a more vivid conception and understanding of our ways. Thus, besides Baptism, Chrism, the Eucharist, Anglican Ordinations and the Seventh Oecumenical Council, concerning which, as has been shown, views and opinions were exchanged with the Committees from Athens, Roumania, and Serbia, in the frequent meetings with us of members of the Standing Committee and of those present at Lambeth, other important points were touched on briefly or at length and formed the subject of discussion. These points were as follows: the teaching regarding tradition, the teaching regarding the Church, the Creeds in use among the Anglicans, more especially the question concerning the Nicaeo-Constantinopolitan Creed and the addition to it, the documents of the Anglican Church bearing the character of Creeds, the Thirty-nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer, the Sacrament of Marriage from certain canonical standpoints, and especially the Sacrament of Confession and of Unction. Other questions dealt with the condition of those who die in the Lord, and the relation to and fellowship with them of the Church Militant, and the manner and method of the use among us of 'Economy'.

In addition to these things, there were certain questions to which the *Encyclical Letter*¹ of 20th January of the Locum Tenens of the Oecumenical Chair gave rise, such as the uniform Calendar, reciprocal intercourse and communication between the two Churches by letters, interchange of English students studying among us, and of Greek students studying in England, meetings of professors, exchange of ecclesiastical periodicals and books, the publication of a common magazine, &c. It should be noticed that all the above questions and subjects, which were set forth in discussion or concerning which interpretations and explanations were asked, did not proceed from a programme fixed beforehand, and so were set forth for discussion generally in an off-hand manner and without system, so much the more as one question brought up another, and that a third, and so on. The subject which, in their meetings with us, each of the Anglican Committees expressed particular readiness to discuss and desired to make the chief matter for consideration, in order that they might receive answers and assurances as favourable as possible, was the question of Intercommunion, to which they seem to attribute the greatest importance. The other questions were brought up by us, as we desired to lay a good and safe basis for discussion and for union under the Divine Will, or by the English themselves. The above and the further report and formulation of what was done constitutes a systematic, though brief, representation of the whole, such as the proceedings of our meetings by no means provide. By such a systematic arrangement the consideration is rendered much easier, and the picture of the whole is as clear as possible without vain and laborious repetitions.

We have said above that the question which above all interests the Anglicans, as clearly appeared from the discussions with the Committees from Athens, Roumania, and

¹ See p. 44 *supra*.

Serbia, was and is Intercommunion. The Anglicans, in other words, gladly accepting the position that they admit our people to the celebration of any Sacrament among their members, desire and ask that in like manner our people abroad, wherever they may be without their own priests, should make use of their priests and Bishops for the Administration of Baptism, Chrism, the Eucharist, and Marriage, under the indispensable condition, that our Church should recognize their acts as canonical, and should in no wise disown them as void or inoperative. The motives which undoubtedly urge them to such a lively desire and request are easily understood, especially by those who know the religious character of the English, and particularly their leaders. There is a sincere desire to supply the religious needs of the members of our Church, who are found all over the world, and in most cases, indisputably, are unable, if they wish it, to perform their religious duties often for many years.

But there is also another reason which leads and urges them to the above-mentioned desire and request. This reason is that on account of their practical character it usually happens that they think that one should begin with deeds and action, and then proceed to the principles and theories (which have meantime been set aside).

So judging and thinking, they consider that for the present the way would be smoother through such relation and intercourse of the Churches, so that thus gradually and almost imperceptibly the great work of union would be accomplished. But such an estimate of the position by the English is justified by their essentially different conception of the idea of the Church and the members who compose it. The idea of the Church among them, as many of us do not realize, is much wider than ours. While with us the true member of the Church, who continues in organic union with the whole, must accept the whole of our teaching, share canonically in the Holy Sacraments, and believe in

lawfully settled ecclesiastical principles, in the English Church men differing from each other in faith, not in things indifferent and non-essential, constitute one undivided whole. These things being so, it is very easy to understand that they perceive no difficulty in sacramental intercourse with us, whom also they look upon generally as representing the ancient undivided Church, while we do perceive a difficulty as we find ourselves, to crown all, face to face with the still not finally solved questions of the validity or non-validity, the canonicity or non-canonicity of Anglican orders.

To however great an extent, in conformity with our Mission, we were inspired with the most friendly feelings, and the warmest zeal for a new approach, we could not agree to views of such a nature, without abandoning the foundation on which essentially our Church is built. This was our view formerly, and after our stay in England we were the more persuaded that excessive tolerance of latitude, and complacency towards heterodox religious views, and intercommunion without previous understanding and agreement regarding dogma and teaching, is not the way which leads to a sure and safe union of the Christian Churches. It was natural that men exceptionally enlightened and of sincere goodwill should not deny us justice, and that they should in essence agree to our view that on one condition, essential and right, we must agree, namely, that as an indispensable condition of dogmatic union, bringing with it canonical and ready Intercommunion, we should put before them for acceptance the essential and crucial points of our teaching; the decisions and enactments of the Oecumenical Councils, serving, at their suggestion, as a model for this purpose. Such a work, preparatorily at all events, a competent Committee might undertake, such as that which is now presided over by the Bishop of Cyzicus, by itself, or in co-operation with the similar one at Athens, and in time

perhaps with representatives of the other Orthodox Churches. Such an effort as is asked of us by the Church of England, through its Standing Committee, in spite of all the difficulties which are in the way, would be of great service to ourselves, making us better orientated to the situation, and defining and explaining the things not accurately defined and clear. The Standing Committee of the English Theologians has undertaken to perform an analogous work. In the near future it will submit the minimum of conditions on which it will agree to ours. So there would be opened, and there ought to be opened, a constant, permanent, and living fellowship between the two Committees mentioned, capable of bringing many blessings.

After this settlement of the question generally and fundamentally, regarding the pressing religious necessities of Englishmen and Greeks abroad, and regarding our enlightenment of each other and the preparations of a more favourable ground for co-operation, we came to the discussion and exchange of views regarding all the before-mentioned subjects and questions.

Thus, *first*, as to Baptism administered by English priests, we could not accept its validity either *simpliciter* or by *Economy* (taking the same position as the Committee from Greece and the other Orthodox Committees), and we expressed regarding this the desire that, if possible, the direction of the Prayer Book which orders immersion should be put in force, and that the custom of immersion, in use in some parts, India, for example, should be extended, and that also the administration of Baptism by Deacons, which is rather common in England, should be limited as far as possible. As to the observation made to us regarding the practice of the Russian Church, which does not re-baptize those who come from the Roman Church or the Anglican, it was necessary to develop the arguments by which our Church was brought to the necessity in 1756 of

imposing the re-baptism of Roman Catholics, which was yet never strictly observed.

Secondly, as to Chrism (Confirmation). In conformity with the historical data, we thought that we should not insist upon its administration by the Holy Oil, instead of by the laying on of hands, but we thought that we could not unreservedly make a declaration regarding its validity, as administered by an Anglican Bishop, so long as the question of the complete validity and canonicity of the Anglican Hierarchy and Orders is not decided by us.

In agreement with the observation made by the Committee from Athens, we thought that we could direct the attention of those who talked with us to the significance of the Sacrament, and to the necessity that he who has been born again through Baptism should complete his new spiritual life through the Chrism, at the same time as he emerges from the Holy Font. The justice of such an observation the English have admitted even previously, although they continue to advance the argument of the necessity of postponing the Chrism (i. e. the laying on of hands with them), that the child may first be taught the Faith which he has received, and have some consciousness of himself.

In regard to the Holy Oil, certain questions were asked of us relating to the necessary nature of the ingredients for its preparation, of the manner, and of the limitation of its preparation to the Chair of Constantinople alone, &c. To all these questions appropriate answers were given.

Thirdly, as to the question of the Holy Eucharist, and the providing of Holy Communion for our people, where there are no priests of our Church, we thought that we should repeat what we said regarding the Sacrament of Chrism, seeing that the consecration of the gifts depends on the validity and canonicity of the Orders of the celebrant of the Sacrament. We expressed also the hope that the Anglican teaching regarding the Sacrament might be defined as far

as possible by the characterization of the Eucharist as a Sacrifice and Propitiation, and that at the same time there should be added to the form of its celebration the Invocation of the Holy Spirit which is necessary to the change of the Holy Gifts. As to this point we heard with pleasure that already in Scotland and America such a prayer is used, which also will be added in the revision of the Prayer Book. The term 'transubstantiation', which lends itself to misinterpretation, was touched upon, and we thought that to facilitate the matter, we could declare that we would be satisfied with 'change' or 'transform' by which the real change is indicated.

We also made some observations with regard to the substitution if possible of wafers for bread, which in some places is the use among them, and with regard to the mixture of the wine with water.

Here we think that we should mention that we heard as a certain fact, and well evidenced, that during the duration at least of the period of war, Englishmen in Macedonia received the Sacrament from Serbian priests, who had permission for the purpose from the competent Church authorities, that the Serbian students staying in England received from Anglican priests, and that the Bishop of Zicha, the Rt. Rev. Nicholai Velimirovic, joined in the celebration with the Anglicans, and received the Eucharist. It was also told us that the Patriarch Tikhon permitted such Intercommunion, which, as is known, the previous Russian Metropolitans by no means permitted.

Fourthly, it was to be expected that there would be a long discussion regarding the validity and the character of the Anglican Ordination. The members of the Standing Committee, where alone this topic was dealt with, tried to convince us, drawing their arguments from the Book of Common Prayer, that from the dogmatic and liturgical point of view the Anglican Ordination is well established and that it bears all the marks of the Sacrament, although

the use of this term is wanting in the Ordinal and in the forms of the other Sacraments, except Baptism and the Eucharist. And in fact no one can deny that among the English their Prayer Book presents mostly some such idea of this Sacrament, and to this Book as an expression of belief they give the highest significance. But we did not think that we should yet express an unreserved and personal opinion about this important question, deeming that it must still be examined among us, both for other reasons, and on account of the known negative attitude of the Western Church, which we cannot pass by without testing and examination. None the less, we did not fail to show the complete friendly spirit which holds among us regarding this question. It should be noted here that those from Serbia and Roumania and those from Athens, in America insisted on the necessity that Holy Orders should be called a Sacrament. With regard to this those who spoke with us did not seem to find any difficulty on the basis of the definition of a Sacrament as a divinely appointed rite giving through visible signs the invisible Grace of the Holy Spirit.

Something analogous we put forward in reference to the other Sacraments (except Baptism and the Eucharist), formulating our proposal somewhat thus: 'Granted that the sacramental character of the five Sacraments is recognized on your part, it would be desirable that the Church of England should formulate definitely the number of the Sacraments, accepting the fact that they are of divine institution, in spite of the admitted superiority of two of them.' This proposal gave rise to explanation of the sense in which Baptism and the Eucharist are named Sacraments among them, without excluding the other rites from such characterization. We think it superfluous to enter into details on this point, the more so as the relative reasons and arguments are known from other sources.

Fifthly, concerning the Seventh Oecumenical Council there was no necessity for long discussion, because this subject

was sufficiently discussed with the Committee under the Metropolitan of Athens and the discussion seemed to have ended in a satisfactory conclusion.¹ Yet, an opportunity occurring, we thought that we should make clear that the acceptance of the Seventh Oecumenical Council as such is indispensable, it being granted that it presents all the marks for acknowledgement and acceptance. The Committee of Bishops assured us that they had taken note of this declaration of ours, and it seems that on this question a favourable wind blows, at least in certain quarters, and it is observed also that in practice there is a gradual return to the earlier but of course not superstitious practice of giving honour to the Saints and their images.

Sixthly, we also received an assurance from the Committee of Bishops that the phrase in the book of Bishop John Wordsworth, page 11, contained no meaning tending to the undervaluing of Holy Tradition.²

Seventhly, being questioned as to the meaning of the phrase in the *Encyclical Letter from the Patriarchate*,³ we found it necessary to make clear that our Church had not yet, like the Western Church, made a public pronouncement regarding the possibility of the salvation of Christians outside its bosom, but that, as was to be expected, it does not accept those who do not belong to it as forming a part of the Church in the true and proper sense of the word. Accordingly, whenever it uses the term Church with regard to the Churches which are not 'Orthodox', it uses it in a wider sense, and not in the narrow and proper sense of the word.

Eighthly, as it is known, that, for the confession of their

¹ See *The Seventh General Council and the Doctrine of Icons*. S. P. C. K. 1919.

² See *Some Points in the Teaching of the Church of England, set forth for the Information of Orthodox Christians of the East*. John Wordsworth, D.D., Bishop of Salisbury. S. P. C. K. 1900.

³ See p. 44 *supra*, 'Unto all the Churches of Christ wheresoever they be.'

Christian faith, the Anglicans use not only the Nicene Creed, but also the Apostles' Creed and the Athanasian Creed, we thought that we could submit this proposal. The superior authority which the Nicene Creed possesses being accepted, we should prefer that the Church of England, in the expression of its Faith, should limit itself to this Creed only. The proposal was received in a sufficiently favourable way, the superior validity and authority of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed was acknowledged, and it was looked upon as the only one indispensable in the fellowship of the Churches. It was pointed out to us that this Creed as the Creed of the Oecumenical Faith is used by them in the Communion Office, and on special occasions, such as the opening of the Conference at Lambeth. It was observed that the Athanasian Creed is looked upon simply as a hymn, and has already been abandoned in America, but that the Apostles' Creed as connected with the administration of Baptism was difficult to lay aside. They took up a more unyielding position on the question of the addition made to the Creed, an addition which should not have been made. Here are the words of the very sympathetic President of the Committee of Bishops: 'We understand your position very well. We have always recognized with regret that the addition was made in an un-canonical manner. We would not wish to demand from you the acknowledgement of the words. As long as you are persuaded that our teaching is the same as that of John Damascene we hope that you would have no difficulty about both Churches continuing to recite the Creed as each has received it.' Here are the words of the distinguished theologian who presided over the Standing Committee: 'We think it right to continue keeping the addition, while we would recognize at the same time that the Orthodox Church holds the Creed in its ancient form. For us the *Filioque* clause contains teaching of the highest significance: we acknowledge that in the

beginning the Creed was drawn up without the addition.' As an argument for the possibility of retaining the addition the example was brought forward, according to which the Seventh Oecumenical Council recognized a letter of Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, and one of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, which contained a confession of Faith, the one with the words 'From the Father through the Son', the other only 'From the Father'. The said Council recognized both letters as Orthodox.

With regard to this noteworthy example, it was natural that we should observe that an addition to the Oecumenical Creed was one thing and a free expression of confession of Faith another. To the latter a phrase expressing an Orthodox sense could be added.

Ninthly, in view of the fact that the work of union would be strongly advanced by the abolition of the well-known Thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican Confession, the more so as these have already been abolished in some places, in Episcopal Churches outside England, the American and the Scottish, for example, we thought that it would not be offensive to propose their general abolition. In answer we were given certain explanations such as the following: 'The aim of Elizabeth and her counsellors was to find a means to the reconciliation of those of Catholic and Protestant tendencies. It was a time of disorder, when different Articles of Faith were put forward by different parties in Europe. So it happened also in the Thirty-nine Articles. Our Theologians accentuated the fact that these did not impose a new Faith but were composed to put an end to disputes. They were therefore Articles of reunion. Their aim was not the definition of doctrines. They were not Articles of Faith, but Articles of a practical public State confession, as is shown by their vague character. There is no branch of the Church which has not forms that might be rejected, yet are difficult to reject. In the last fifty years the Thirty-nine Articles have fallen, while the

Creeds have risen, in public estimation. If you wish to learn the mind of the Church of England, study the Prayer Book and not the Thirty-nine Articles.' Such words, in addition to others, the President of the Standing Committee spoke, and the President of the Committee of Bishops spoke somewhat as follows: 'We understand that the abolition of the Thirty-nine Articles would be an advantage. It is true that with us these have much less force than the Prayer Book and the Catechism. In some sections of the English Church they are not used at all. We do not ask that another Church which desires to enter into relations with us should accept them. They were written to suit the sixteenth century, for the confuting of heresies. Many of them are already obsolete. Given an opportunity the Articles might be revised.' In conformity with the concluding words of the Bishop of Gloucester it was proposed to us by the Standing Committee that our similar Standing Committee should undertake to suggest what alterations in our opinion are necessary. As long as no separation between Church and State is made in England, such as has happened already outside it, as in Scotland and Wales, it appears in fact that only a revision of these Articles will perhaps be possible. This revision, being invested with a competent authority, would evidently, in great measure, take the place of a final abolition of the Articles.

Tenthly, with regard to the Prayer Book, the President of the Committee of Bishops pointed out to us that this enjoys the fullest authority, because it was accepted in 1662 by the Provinces of Canterbury and York; that it is their public and authoritative teaching, on the basis of the principle of *Lex orandi lex credendi*, and that they continually make use of it as a rule of Faith. It is evident that such high estimation of the Prayer Book, which affords much the more favourable basis for co-operation and coming together, is very acceptable, the more so as it is being steadily

amended and revised. To its revision we also were invited to contribute.

We said above that the English ask and desire that it should be permitted to them canonically not only to baptize and confirm our people, where there is an absolute necessity for this, and to give them Communion, but also to marry them. Especially on the question of mixed marriages, a document relating to this is submitted through us to the Patriarchate, in which it is asked that in such case the Sacramental Celebration of the marriage should be performed once only either by our priest or by the Anglican priest, and also that respect should be shown by each Church to the canonical impediments in force in the other. Their question is worthy of consideration, whether the Oecumenical Patriarchate would prefer that its spiritual children should be limited to civil marriage or just live together through the want of an Orthodox priest, or should be married by an Anglican priest.

With regard to the Sacrament of Confession they had been told by the Serbians and Roumanians that in many parts of the East this has become a mere form and that among the Serbians there is no private Confession. With regard to this we were asked if among us those who confessed did so before the congregation or privately. We gave the necessary explanations.

Certain explanations were asked from us also regarding the Sacrament of Unction, about its aim and significance, and also about its liturgical side.

With regard to those who die in the Lord, we heard with pleasure the following facts. 'The position of the Church of England regarding prayers for the dead has changed much of late, and most of all since the war, and hence our people yearn for them much. Such prayers have never been forbidden among us, they were only restricted on account of the Popish abuses in the

Middle Ages. Such prayers are beginning to prevail not only among the "High Church" but also among the "Low and Broad Church". What we condemn is not prayer for the departed but the Roman doctrine of Purgatory. At the funeral of Lord Kitchener a *requiem* was celebrated, i. e. a celebration for the rest of his soul. Our Bishops have frequently and for a long time permitted petitions for the departed. To-day those who have undertaken the revision of the Prayer Book have expressly put forward the necessity for such an addition. Up to this time the faithful of the Church of England have never ceased from praying privately for their dead, but now this will be further recommended to them publicly by the Church.'

Much perplexity is reasonably caused to the English as to the significance and manner of application of the 'Economy' so much in use in our Church which, it seems, they would gladly see applied to our relations with them. In answer to the requests for explanation from us, we pointed out that 'Economy' has no force when it is a question of dogmatic matters and of fundamental canonical and other points, and it is opposed to the 'strictness' according to which all the conditions of validity and canonicity are applied.

With much pleasure we perceived the high esteem which the *Encyclical Letter*¹ from the Patriarchate received, and from its issue and content it also gave occasion to us for discussion on certain points. Among the most important of these was the question of a uniform Calendar, and also of the common observance of Easter. We were informed that in England there is a great movement for fixing Easter upon a certain determined day, for example, the first Sunday of April. We also learned that the English Government has received a proposal for an international agreement on a Calendar, and has answered that if the other

¹ See p. 44 *supra*.

Powers take part in it they will not refuse to share in it. In connexion with this we described the old and the new movement among us concerning the Calendar, as also the known reasons which compelled our Church to insist upon the Julian and reject the Gregorian. They were pleased to be made aware of our further labours relating thereto and of their results, that they may think and act accordingly.

There was adequate discussion also concerning the benefit which would result from visits to us by English theologians, and their stay for some time among us, and from similar visits by our theologians to England, giving lectures perhaps about our Church.

The question of the study of Englishmen in our Theological School, and the training of our students at Oxford, also occupied us not a little, particularly with regard to the manner of living and studying which was to be preferred as the more beneficial, whether, that is, our students of Theology at Oxford should each live privately wherever he might decide, or whether they should stay in one of the Colleges, or under the special care of a competent person as is done in the case of the Serbian students. It was decided that at the proper time our Standing Committee should come to an understanding on the matter with the Anglican Committee which supervises the Serbian students.

The interchange of ecclesiastical magazines and books was gladly accepted, and the question of a common magazine was discussed, but nevertheless fell to the ground for the present owing to insuperable economic difficulties.

Such was the end of our work with the two Committees, when the whole work of the Conference was finished, concluding with a public Festal Celebration of the Holy Communion, at which we also were present, being honoured as at the similar opening. It would have been natural for us to leave London immediately, but we thought that we should remain for a few days that, according to the promise

given to us, we might receive knowledge of the general resolutions of the Conference. So we return bringing these resolutions in print, together with the letters of the Archbishop of Canterbury. His Grace the Primate of England in his letter to the Right Reverend the Locum Tenens of the Patriarchal Oecumenical Throne expresses his belief that our Reverend and Holy Synod will see that the journey to London of the Patriarchal representatives was by no means in vain, but that it has given new and vigorous life to the reciprocal friendly relations of the two Churches. The Conference of Bishops expresses a like belief in similar words in its Resolution No. 18, which runs thus: 'The Conference heartily thanks the Oecumenical Patriarchate for the Mission of the Metropolitan of Demotica and others to confer with its members on questions concerning the relations between the Anglican and Eastern Churches, and expresses its grateful appreciation of the great help given to its Committee by the Delegation.' How this Committee of English Bishops estimated the work of the Patriarchal Delegation your Reverend and Holy Synod will see from the following, which we take from its Report submitted to the complete Conference and contained in pages 144 following of the published proceedings of the Conference.

The Committee undertaking to discuss questions regarding union with the Episcopal Churches thinks rightly that it can by no means pass by the Roman Catholic Church, the more so as it finds certain new indications which give birth to a certain hope for the future regarding union with that Church also.

After speaking concerning the Roman Church, the Committee passes on to speak of the Orthodox Eastern Churches, and first of the Russian Church, to which it devotes a good many words, depicting the cultivation of living relations between the two Churches both before

and during the late war up to the revolution in that country. The Committee after this, speaking with great grief for the tragic fate of many Russian priests of higher and lower rank, observes none the less that in the wreck and ruin of all other institutions in Russia, the Church, though after many sufferings, survives, and will in the future, as the Committee hopes, when able to reconstruct its organization, establish new and yet more friendly relations with the Church of England.

To the Serbian Church the Committee devotes fewer words, referring to the great difficulties of that Church during the war, and the great support which it received, especially in England and in America, so that very close relations were cultivated between the two Churches, and the Bishop of Zicha, Nicholai Velimirovic, has contributed much to this end.

In the course of our excursion to Oxford we had the pleasure of becoming acquainted with the hostel of the Serbian students educated there at the expense of the English, and with two of the students. This hostel is under the constant supervision of a competent person.

The Committee speaks about our Church at a good deal greater length than about the Russian and Serbian Churches, writing in the following words :

‘ In Greece also, and indeed in all parts of the East, the war has profoundly affected our relations with the Orthodox Church. It has brought the Anglican and Eastern Churches much nearer to each other. We hear from many different places of remarkable instances of what we may call informal acts of intercommunion in emergencies which would have been quite impossible a few years ago, and which show the close sympathy there is between the two Churches. The war has changed the attitude of the East to Western Christendom. We are told that there is a great turning to England and America,

and a desire to know more about us and our Communion, about which there is still too little known in the East generally. But partly because of the position of England in the war, and because of belief in its power, there has been a real stretching out of hands and a desire shown in more than one quarter to learn and make advances towards us. It is well understood by this time in the East that we have no ulterior aims in seeking closer relations with them, and we are free from the suspicion of any attempt to proselytize, an attempt which naturally they would bitterly resent. During these last few years we have had several visits to our shores from distinguished Eastern prelates, and important Conferences have been held both in this country and in America for the discussion of doctrinal questions. We note also the cordial reception accorded to the Bishop of London and others in their visits to the East, and in particular the position assigned at the Liturgy to the Bishop of Gibraltar and the Bishop of Harrisburg, which seems to have gone beyond the extension of ordinary courtesies. These things will bear fruit in years to come. Another welcome sign of East and West drawing closer together is found in the letter from the Locum Tenens of the Oecumenical Patriarchate at Constantinople "unto all the Churches of Christ where-soever they be", which was sent from the Phanar to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Chief in importance, however, has been the visit of a special delegation from the Oecumenical Patriarchate to London, for purposes of consultation with Bishops attending the Lambeth Conference on relations between the Orthodox and Anglican Communions. This visit was the result of a formal invitation from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Locum Tenens of the Oecumenical Patriarchate at Constantinople. To this visit we have reason to attach the greatest importance. The delegation, consisting of Philaretos the Metropolitan

of Demotica, Professor Komninos of Halki, the Archimandrite Pagonis of London, and the Archpriest Callinicos of Manchester, was welcomed by the President in full session of the Conference, and your Committee has had the advantage of more than one conference with it, at which important questions, doctrinal and practical, were discussed and full consideration given to the matters specified in the letter from the Phanar referred to above, in which letter we would call special attention to the desire expressed for immediate co-operation in matters of social reform.

‘ Along the lines here briefly indicated we believe that we are steadily moving towards the goal of ultimate reunion. But there is much still to be done before this is reached, and our progress will be not less sure because it is slow. We still require to gain greater knowledge and understanding of each other’s position. Explanations are needed on both sides, and it is clear that when the day comes for definite proposals of formal intercommunion to be made, they will have to be based on a large-hearted tolerance on both sides, and a readiness on the part of each Church to be content with holding its own uses and practices without attempting to ask for conformity to them on the part of the other.

‘ Meanwhile, we look for much from the Eastern Churches Committee recently appointed on a permanent basis by the Archbishop of Canterbury in pursuance of Resolution 61 of the last Lambeth Conference. We are glad to learn that this action has been met by the appointment of somewhat similar Committees both at Constantinople and at Athens. The American Church has also appointed a permanent Commission to confer with the Eastern Churches. We believe that through the action of these Committees further important steps towards reunion may be taken, partly by the free discussion of doctrinal

matters, e.g., the meaning of the Filioque clause, as not involving any belief on our part in more than one *aîría* in the Godhead, our doctrine of holy orders, the position of the XXXIX Articles, on all of which matters the Easterns are asking for information, and partly also by conference on practical matters of moment, such as the better regulation of mixed marriages, the reciprocal administration of the Sacraments in cases of emergency, a uniform Kalendar, possibly involving the appointment of a fixed Easter, and other questions raised in the letter from the Phanar.

‘We need at the present time not only or chiefly to afford to the Easterns historical evidence of the handing down of our ministry, but also to explain the doctrinal position held by our Communion. It is in particular of the first importance, in order to remove Oriental misconceptions, to make it clear from our formularies that we regard Ordination as conferring grace, and not only as a mere setting apart to an ecclesiastical office. It would also (though in a lesser degree) be a help, as well as a good thing in itself, to restore the true text of the “Nicene” Creed, as it is used in all parts of the East and West, except in our Communion, by replacing the word “Holy” before “Catholic and Apostolic Church”’.

‘If some members of the Eastern Churches Committee could visit Athens or Constantinople for conferences to be held there, such as those already held in this country and in America, we believe that they would not only meet with a cordial welcome, but also be able to do much to remove misconceptions, and to prepare the way for the ultimate reunion which both Churches alike so earnestly desire, and for which they make their constant prayer.’

So far regarding the things accomplished by us to the best of our ability, and the favourable judgements concerning them of the English Archbishop, of the Committee of the Lambeth Conference, and of that Conference itself.

Without at all claiming that we have accomplished any-

thing great or fine, but rather trusting to the clemency of judgement and the indulgent opinion of the venerable members of both the Committees, we cannot conceal that we expected from them and from the full Lambeth Conference something better in relation to our affairs, and rather different from that which we now read in its published proceedings and to which the Most Reverend Primate of England judges it right to direct our attention in his letter to the Locum Tenens of the Patriarchal Throne. That your Reverend and Holy Synod may form some idea about these things, we offer now the more important relative extracts from the documents mentioned. Thus on page 12, in addition to other matters which form the contents of the Encyclical Letter, which is addressed by the Bishops of the Conference 'To the Faithful in Christ Jesus', we read these words :

'Terms of reunion must no longer be judged by the success with which they meet the claims and preserve the positions of two or more uniting Communions, but by their correspondence to the common ideal of the Church as God would have it to be. Again, in the past, negotiations for reunion have often started with the attempt to define the measure of uniformity which is essential. The impression has been given, that nothing else matters. Now we see that those elements of truth about which differences have arisen are essential to the fullness of the witness of the whole Church. We have no need to belittle what is distinctive in our own interpretation of Christian life : we believe that it is something precious which we hold in trust for the common good. We desire that others should share in our heritage and our blessings, as we wish to share in theirs. It is not by reducing the different groups of Christians to uniformity, but by rightly using their diversity, that the Church can become all things to all men. So long as there is vital connexion with the Head, there is positive value in the differentiation of the

members. But we are convinced that this ideal cannot be fulfilled if these groups are content to remain in separation from one another or to be joined together only in some vague federation. Their value for the fullness of Christian life, truth, and witness can only be realized if they are united in the fellowship of one visible society whose members are bound together by the ties of a common faith, common sacraments, and a common ministry. It is towards this ideal of a united and truly Catholic Church that we must all set our minds.'

What the Bishops of the Lambeth Conference mean by these words 'this united and truly Catholic Church' that is to be, and what conditions they suggest for its constitution will be better understood by any one who reads the 'Appeal to all Christian people'.

For this very noteworthy Appeal which is unquestionably inspired by great Christian zeal, we may conclude that the Archbishops, Metropolitans, and Bishops understand 'the Church' in a very wide sense, and that they also make the indispensable conditions for the foundation of the one United Church very wide, adapted rather to their own views than to ours. In addition, their religious and ecclesiastical needs lead them to put forward measures in relation to the non-episcopal Churches which also, in spite of all goodwill, manifestly conflict with venerated principles and systems. Notwithstanding all these things, since in this historical document, being of the nature it is, there is splendidly shown the extent of the burning desire of the Anglicans for the union of separated Christians, we think that a sacred duty lies upon us also to continue doing all that we can and contributing to the making easy of the way for such a God-pleasing work of union, trusting that the Almighty hand of God will in time remove the obstacles, and bring to its fulfilment a work which will constitute a blessing to the Christian World.

17. *Terms of Intercommunion suggested between the Church of England and the Churches in Communion with her and the Eastern Orthodox Church*

[These terms were drawn up at the request of the Eastern Churches Committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and are now (1921) published at their request in the hope that they may facilitate further consideration of the whole question.]

I

Of the Christian Faith

We accept the Faith of Christ as it is taught us by the Holy Scriptures, and as it has been handed down to us in the Creed of the Catholic Church,¹ and as it is expounded in the dogmatic decisions of the Oecumenical Councils as accepted by the Undivided Church.

II

Of the Canon of Scripture

We accept the Canon of Scripture as it is defined by St. Athanasius,² and as it has been received by the whole Catholic Church; namely, the twenty-two books of the Old Testament which are contained in the Hebrew Canon, and the twenty-seven books of the New Testament. As regards the other books, which are called sometimes Deutero-canonical, sometimes *Ἀναγινωσκόμενα*, sometimes *Apocrypha*, we also accept the teaching of St. Athanasius: 'for greater exactness I add this also . . . that there are other books besides these [books], not indeed included in the Canon, but appointed by the Fathers to be read by those who newly join us, and wish to be instructed in the word of

¹ See Section IV.

² *Festal Epistle* xxxix.

godliness . . . the former [books] . . . being included in the Canon, the latter being [only] read';¹ and the teaching of St. Jerome 'that the Church may read them for the edification of the people, not for the confirmation of the authority of ecclesiastical dogmas'.²

III

Of the Sufficiency of Holy Scripture

We believe that Holy Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation, as St. Athanasius says, 'The sacred and inspired Scriptures are sufficient to declare the truth.'³ And elsewhere, 'These are the fountains of salvation, that he who thirsts may be satisfied with the oracles contained in them. In these [books] alone is proclaimed the doctrine of godliness. Let no man add to them, nor take aught from them';⁴ and, as St. Augustine says: 'In those things which are plainly laid down in Scripture all things are found which comprise faith and morals'.⁵ As

¹ S. Ath. *Ep. Fest.* xxxix (ed. Bened., Paris, 1698, ii. p. 962): ἀλλ' ἐνεκά γε πλείονος ἀκριβείας προστίθῃμι καὶ τοῦτο γράφων ἀναγκαίως, ὥς ὅτι ἔστι καὶ ἑτέρα βιβλία τούτων ἔξωθεν, οὐ κανονιζόμενα μὲν, τετυπωμένα δὲ παρὰ τῶν πατέρων ἀναγινώσκεισθαι τοῖς ἄρτι προσερχομένοις καὶ βουλομένοις κατηχεῖσθαι τὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας λόγον . . . καὶ ὅμως, ἀγαπητοί, κἀκείνων κανονιζόμενων καὶ τούτων ἀναγινωσκομένων κτλ.

² *Prol. in Libros Salom.*: Sicut ergo Iudith et Machabaeorum libros legit quidem Ecclesia, sed eos inter canonicas Scripturas non recepit, sic et haec duo volumina [Ecclesiasticum et Sapientiam] legat ad aedificationem plebis, non ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam.

³ S. Ath. *contra Gentes* 1 § 3: αὐτάρκεις μὲν γάρ εἰσιν αἱ ἅγαι καὶ θεόπνευστοι γραφαὶ πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπαγγελίαν. Cp. *de Synod.* 6, ad *Episc. Aegypt.* 6

⁴ S. Ath. *Ep. Fest.* xxxix: ταῦτα πηγαὶ τοῦ σωτηρίου, ὥστε τὸν διψῶντα ἐν τούτοις ἐμφορεῖσθαι λογίων· ἐν τούτοις μόνοις τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας διδασκαλεῖον εὐαγγελίζεται· μηδεὶς τούτοις ἐπιβαλλέτω, μηδὲ τούτων ἀφαιρέσθω τι.

⁵ S. Aug. *de Doctrina Christiana*, ii. 9: in eis enim quae aperte in Scripturis positae sunt inveniuntur illa omnia quae continent fidem, moresque vivendi, spem scilicet atque caritatem.

touching Tradition, we accept it, in the words of the *Longer Catechism* of the Russian Church, 'as a guide to the right understanding of Holy Scripture, for the right ministration of the Sacraments, and the preservation of sacred rites and ceremonies in the purity of their original institution'; and 'we must follow that tradition which agrees with the divine revelation and with Holy Scripture'.¹

IV

Of the Creed of the Church

We accept as the creed of the Catholic Church that which is sometimes called the Creed of Constantinople, and in the formularies of the Church of England is called the Nicene Creed; which was put forth by the Council of Chalcedon and has been accepted by the whole Catholic Church.

V

Of the Exposition of Faith of the Council of Chalcedon

We accept also as explaining the Creed the Exposition of Faith which was put forth by the Council of Chalcedon.

VI

That no one may put forth any other Creed

Whereas it is stated in the Exposition of faith of the Council of Chalcedon that 'these things having been defined by us with all possible accuracy and care, the Holy and Oecumenical Synod hath decreed that it is unlawful for any one to present, or compile, or compose, or believe, or teach to others, any other creed; and that those who dare either to compose another creed, or to bring forward, or to

¹ *Longer Catechism*. English Translation in *The Doctrine of the Russian Church*. By the Rev. R. W. Blackmore (Aberdeen, 1845), p. 36.

teach, or to deliver another symbol to those wishing to turn from paganism or from Judaism or from heresy of what sort soever, to the full knowledge of the truth, these, if bishops or clerics, be deposed, the bishops from the episcopate and clerics from the clerical office ; and, if monks or laics, they be anathematized'.¹ We recognize that it is unlawful for a Church to demand any further statement of faith as a necessary condition of intercommunion ; but that it is not unlawful for the several Churches to use as their baptismal creed some other creed agreeable to the tradition of the Church, as in the Western Church that which is called the Apostles' Creed is and always has been so used. Nor is it unlawful for a Church to use any other similar document in the services of the Church, or for the instruction of the Faithful, provided that it is agreeable to orthodox doctrine.

VII

Of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit

Whereas there has been a difference, as between the East and the West, in the language used concerning the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit, so that it has been the custom in the East to say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, and in the West that He proceeds from the Father and the Son, we recognize that both forms of expression may rightly be used, and that they are intended to express the same faith. While we reject every conception or form of

¹ *Expos. fidei Conc. Chal.* (Mansi, *Concilia*, vii. 116) : τούτων τοίνυν μετὰ πίσης πανταχούθεν ἀκριβείας τε καὶ ἐμμελείας παρ' ἡμῶν διατυπωθέντων, ὥρισεν ἡ ἁγία καὶ οἰκουμένη Σύνδος ἑτέραν πίστιν μηδενὶ ἐξεῖναι προφέρειν ἢ γοῦν συγγράφειν ἢ συντιθέναι ἢ φρονεῖν ἢ διδάσκειν ἑτέρους· τοὺς δὲ τοιμῶντας ἢ συντιθέναι πίστιν ἑτέραν ἢ γοῦν προκομίζειν ἢ διδάσκειν ἢ παραδιδόναι ἕτερον σύμβολον τοῖς ἐθέλουσιν ἐπιστρέφειν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐξ Ἑλληνισμοῦ ἢ ἐξ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ ἢ γοῦν ἐξ αἱρέσεως οἰασθηποτοῦν, τούτους, εἰ μὲν εἴεν ἐπίσκοποι ἢ κληρικοί, ἀλλοτρίους εἶναι τοὺς ἐπισκόπους τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς καὶ τοὺς κληρικούς τοῦ κλήρου, εἰ δὲ μονάζοντες ἢ λαϊκοὶ εἴεν ἀναθεματίζεσθαι αὐτούς.

expression which implies the existence of two principles or ἀρχαί or αἰτίαι in the Holy Trinity, we accept the teaching of St. John of Damascus and of the earlier Greek Fathers that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father through the Son.¹

VIII

Of the Filioque Clause

And whereas in the Western Church at some time in the sixth or seventh century the words *Filioque* were added to the Creed, we agree in acknowledging that this addition was not made 'in an ecclesiastically regular manner'; and that in assemblies of Easterns and Westerns the one Creed of the Universal Church ought to be recited without those words; but we are also agreed that, since the added words are used in an orthodox sense, it is lawful for any Church which has received the Creed as containing these words to continue so to recite it in the Services of the Church.

IX

Of Variety of Customs in the Church

St. Augustine divides the usages of the Church into three classes: viz. (1) those customs which have the authority of our Lord and of the Scriptures, of which he says 'Our Lord Jesus Christ has put us under a light yoke and an easy burden as He says Himself in the Gospel; and therefore He has bound together the society of the New People by sacraments in number very few, in observance most easy, and in meaning most excellent: as Baptism consecrated in

¹ On the *Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* and the *Filioque* clause see the extract from the Report of the Bonn Conference of 1875, printed in Appendix I. This Report was carefully examined by a committee of the province of Canterbury in 1875. See Occasional Paper of the *Eastern Church Association*, No. X, Parker, Oxford, 1904, to be obtained from the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association.

the Name of the Trinity, the Communion of His Body and Blood, and anything else that is commended in the Canonical Scriptures'; (2) 'those things which we hold on the authority, not of Scripture, but of tradition, which are observed throughout the whole world', and of these he says it is to be understood that they are retained 'as commended and enacted either by the Apostles themselves or by plenary Councils whose authority in the Church is most salutary'; and (3) 'those things which are different in different places and countries. . . . All such things are free to be observed or not; and there is no better rule for a serious and prudent Christian than to act in such wise as he sees that church to act in which he chances to find himself'.¹ The Patriarch Photius also writes: 'In cases where the thing disregarded is not matter of faith and does not involve a falling away from any general or catholic decree, where different customs and usages are observed in different places, a man who knows how to judge would be right in deciding that neither do those who observe them

¹ S. Aug. *Ep. liv ad Ianuarium* 1-3: Primo itaque tenere te volo quod est huius disputationis caput: Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, sicut Ipse in Evangelio loquitur, leni iugo suo nos subdidisse et sarcinae levi: unde sacramentis numero paucissimis, observatione facillimis, significatione praestantissimis, societatem Novi Populi colligavit, sicut est Baptismus Trinitatis nomine consecratus, Communicatio Corporis et Sanguinis Ipsius, et si quid aliud in Scripturis canonicis commendatur, exceptis iis quae servitutum populi veteris . . . onerabant. . . . Illa autem quae non scripta sed tradita custodimus, quae quidem toto terrarum orbe servantur, datur intelligi vel ab ipsis Apostolis vel plenariis Conciliis, quorum est in Ecclesia saluberrima auctoritas, commendata atque statuta retineri. . . . Alia vero quae per loca terrarum regionesque variantur . . . totum hoc genus rerum liberas habet observationes: nec disciplina ulla est in his melior gravi prudentique Christiano quam ut eo modo agat quo agere viderit ecclesiam ad quam forte devenit. Quod enim neque contra fidem neque contra bonos mores esse convincitur, indifferenter est habendum et propter eorum inter quos vivitur societatem servandum est. Cp. S. Ath. *de Synodis* 5.

act wrongly, nor those who have not received them break the law'.¹ We agree, therefore, to recognize those customs which have the authority of our Lord, of Scripture, and of the Universal Church ; while, as to those which are different in different parts of the Christian world and for which there is not the authority of Scripture or of any general Council, we agree that each Church do retain its own customs.

X

Of the Number of the Sacraments

Inasmuch as the number of the Sacraments has never been authoritatively fixed either by tradition from the Apostles or any decision of an Oecumenical Council, their number has been differently reckoned in the Church at different periods. It was not until the sixteenth century that the number was defined in the Roman Church, or until the seventeenth century in the Eastern. We recognize that the two Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Eucharist are pre-eminent above the rest.² In the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England the title Sacrament is only

¹ 'Εν οἷς οὐκ ἔστι πίστις τὸ ἀθετούμενον, οὐδὲ κοινοῦ τε καὶ καθολικοῦ ψηφίσματος ἔκπτωσις, ἄλλων παρ' ἄλλοις ἔθων τε καὶ νομίμων φυλαττομένων, οὔτε τοὺς φύλακας ἀδικεῖν, οὔτε τοὺς μὴ παραδεχομένους παρανομεῖν, ἔρθως ἂν τις κρίνειν εἰδὼς διορίσασαιτο (Φωτίου τοῦ σοφωτάτου καὶ ἀγιωτάτου Πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Ἐπιστολαί, Βαλέττα, London, 1864, p. 156).

² The Patriarch Jeremiah in his second answer to the Protestants, 1576, writes: 'Αν γὰρ τὰ κυριώτερα τῶν μυστηρίων τὸ βάπτισμα καὶ κοινωνία ἡ θεία ἐστί, καὶ ὧν δίχα σωθῆναι ἀδύνατον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῦτα παρέδωκεν ἡ ἐκκλησία, τὰ λοιπά φημι ἄχρι τῶν ἑπτὰ, ὡς λέγομεν (Συμβολικὴ τῆς ὀρθοδόξου ἀνατολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, ὑπὸ I. E. Μεσολωρα, Athens, 1885, vol. i, p. 228).

So Kritopoulos in his Confession, published in 1661 ('Ὁμολογία Μητροφάνους τοῦ Κριτοπούλου, ib. pp. 313, 314) distinguishes three Sacraments as necessary, Baptism, the Holy Communion (ἡ ἁγία κοινωνία), and Penance (ἡ μετάνοια). Besides these there are other rites, also called Sacraments, which ought to be received, παρὰ ταῦτα δὲ τὰ τρία ἀναγκαῖα μυστηρία εἰς καὶ τινες τελεταὶ μυστικαὶ μυστηρία ἀκακεῖναι ὁμωνύμως καλούμεναι παρὰ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ διὰ τὸ μυστικὸν τε καὶ πνευματικὸν ταῦταις ἐμπεριέχεσθαι.

used of these two as (1) having an outward visible sign ordained by Christ Himself, and (2) as generally necessary for salvation.¹ But we agree further that the title Sacrament may be used of other rites and ceremonies in which there is an outward and visible sign and an inward and spiritual grace, and in that sense it is rightly used of other institutions, such as ordination, penance, confirmation, marriage, and the anointing of the sick ; and in relation to some of these Sacraments, since the customs of the different Churches have varied and still vary, we agree that each Church have liberty to retain its own usages.

XI

Of the Holy Eucharist

The Church has at all times desired to fulfil the Lord's command by the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, and we desire in all things to obey the teaching of Scripture and the regulations of the Universal Church. But whereas there has been much controversy, and many divisions have arisen, as to the more exact definition of the nature of the presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord in the Holy Eucharist ; and whereas there is no decree of any Oecumenical Council touching the manner of the presence of

οἶον τὸ μετὰ τὸ ἅγιον βάπτισμα εὐθὺς παραλαμβανόμενον ἅγιον χρίσμα, ἢ τάξιν τῶν ἱερέων, ὁ πρῶτος γάμος καὶ τὸ εὐχέλαιον.

And the Patriarch Jeremiah in his reply to the Nonjurors (1718) says : ' We hold likewise that the Holy Sacraments are seven in number ; but two only exceed in necessity, and are such as no one can be saved without them. For, as for Baptism, it is our Lord's saying that *Whosoever is not born again of Water and the Spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom of God.* And of the Eucharist, he says : *Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you.*' ' Reply of the Patriarchs to the Nonjurors ' in George Williams, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1868), p. 46.

¹ Of the Sacraments, St. John Damascene treats only of Baptism and the Eucharist (*de Fide Orthodoxa*, iv. 9, 13).

Christ ; and whereas some of the terms that have been used have been used with different significations in different parts of the Church : we agree that this is a Divine Mystery which transcends human understanding, and that the Church has expressed sufficiently its belief in its Liturgies ; and we agree further that the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, as it is taught in the Liturgies of the Orthodox Church, and in the Liturgies of the Church of England and those of the Churches in communion with the Church of England, is adequate and sufficient.

XII

Of the Holy Orders of the Church

In order that the Word of God might be preached and the Sacraments duly administered our Lord instituted a Ministry for His Church and the Apostles ordained ministers by the laying on of hands with prayer, and the Catholic Church has laid down rules for the continuation and ordering of the Ministry. We desire always to fulfil the commands of Christ, the intention of the Apostles, and the rule of the Church. We agree that 'from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons'—and it has always been our intention that these Orders 'be continued and reverently used and esteemed' ;¹ and we agree that in accordance with our common usage and the canon of the Council of Nicaea every bishop be consecrated by three other bishops at least, and that all priests and deacons be ordained by bishops with the laying on of hands and prayer ; and that in Ordination the Holy Spirit is given for the work

¹ *The Form and Manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, according to the order of the Church of England*, Preface. Compare also the words used by the Bishops in the Lambeth Conference of 1908 and 1920 : 'We who speak are bearers of the sacred commission of the ministry given by our Lord through His Apostles to the Church.'

of the Ministry ; and we consider that the forms of Ordination used in the Orthodox Church and in the Church of England are adequate and sufficient.¹

XIII

Of the Sacred Icons

Since there has been much difference of opinion touching the use of Icons, and since there are differences of usage between the East and the West, we express our agreement with the Second Council of Nicaea that the tradition of 'making pictorial representations is agreeable to the history contained in the Evangelic Message, for a confirmation of the real incarnation of God the Word, and serves to our profit in this regard';² and we agree further that worship (λατρεία) pertains to the Divine Nature alone,³ and we accept the words used by the bishop at his consecration in the Russian Church: 'I will take care that the homage due to God be not transferred to holy images nor false miracles be ascribed to them whereby the true worship is perverted and a handle given to adversaries to reproach the Orthodox ; on the contrary I will study that images be respected only in the sense of the Holy Orthodox Church as set forth in the Second Council of Nicaea.' And for other matters we agree that each Church may have liberty to preserve its own distinctive customs, and that in the Western Church figures of Christ and the Saints be allowed which are carved and sculptured contrary to the custom of

¹ See Appendix II.

² *Definitio Conc. Nicaen. II* (Mansi, *Concilia*, xiii. 377) Καὶ συνελόντες φαμέν ἀπάσας τὰς ἐκκλησιαστικὰς ἐγγράφως ἢ ἀγράφως τεθεσπισμένas ἡμῖν παραδόσεις ἀκαινοτομήτως φυλάττομεν· ὧν μία ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ τῆς εἰκονικῆς ἀναζωγραφῆσεως ἐκτύπωσις, ὡς τῇ ἱστορίᾳ τοῦ εὐαγγελικοῦ κηρύγματος συνάδουσα, πρὸς πίστωσιν τῆς ἀληθινῆς καὶ οὐ κατὰ φαντασίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου ἐνανθρωπήσεως, καὶ εἰς ὁμοίαν λυσιτέλειαν ἡμῖν χρησιμεύουσα.

³ *Ibid.* τὴν κατὰ πίστιν ἡμῶν ἀληθινὴν λατρείαν ἣ πρέπει μόνῃ τῇ θεῇ φύσει.

the Eastern Church ; and that the Eastern Church should show reverence to the Sacred Icons in accordance with its own customs and the teaching of the Second Council of Nicaea ; and that neither Church should accuse the other of idolatry or false teaching.

APPENDIX I

Propositions adopted by the Bonn Conference

I

1. We agree in receiving the Oecumenical Creeds and dogmatic decisions of the ancient undivided Church.

2. We agree in acknowledging that the addition of the *Filioque* to the Creed did not take place in an ecclesiastically regular manner.

3. We acknowledge on all sides the representation of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, as it is set forth by the Fathers of the undivided Church.

4. We reject every proposition and every method of expression in which in any way the acknowledgement of two principles or ἀρχαί or αἰτίαι in the Trinity may be contained.

II

We accept the teaching of St. John Damascene on the Holy Ghost, as it is expressed in the following paragraphs in the sense of the teaching of the ancient undivided Church.

1. The Holy Ghost issues out of the Father, as the Beginning (ἀρχή), the Cause (αἰτία), the Source (πηγή), of the Godhead.¹

2. The Holy Ghost does not issue out of the Son (ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ), because there is in the Godhead but one Beginning (ἀρχή), one Cause (αἰτία), through which all that is in the Godhead is produced.²

¹ *De Recta Sententia*, n. 1 ; *Contr. Manich.* n. 4.

² Ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ δὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα οὐ λέγομεν, Πνεῦμα δὲ Υἱοῦ ὀνομάζομεν (*De Fide Orthod.* i. 8).

3. The Holy Ghost issues out of the Father through the Son.¹

4. The Holy Ghost is the Image of the Son, who is the Image of the Father,² issuing out of the Father and resting in the Son as His revealing power.³

5. The Holy Ghost is the personal production out of the Father, belonging to the Son, but not out of the Son, because He is the Spirit of the mouth of God declarative of the Word.⁴

6. The Holy Ghost forms the link between the Father and the Son, and is linked to the Father by the Son.⁵

APPENDIX II

Formulae of Ordination

The following are the formulae of ordination in the Eastern and English Churches.

1. Presbyters.

Αὐτός, Δέσποτα τῶν ἀπάντων, καὶ τοῦτον ὃν εὐδόκησας προχειρισθῆναι παρ' ἐμοῦ ἐν ἀμέμπτῳ πολιτείᾳ καὶ ἀκλινεῖ τῇ πίστει εὐδόκησον ὑποδέξασθαι τὴν μεγάλην ταύτην χάριν τοῦ

¹ Τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκφαντορικὴ τοῦ κρυφίου τῆς Θεότητος δύναμις τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἐκ Πατρὸς μὲν δι' Υἱοῦ ἐκπορευομένη (*De Fide Orthodox.* i. 12). Υἱοῦ δὲ Πνεῦμα, οὐχ ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον (*Ibid.*). Διὰ τοῦ Λόγου αὐτοῦ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον (*Cont. Manich.* n. 5). Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ Λόγου προῖόν (*De Hymno Trisag.* n. 28). Τοῦτ' ἡμῖν ἐστὶ τὸ λατρευόμενον . . . Πνεῦμα ἅγιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον· ὑπὲρ καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λέγεται, ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ φανερούμενον καὶ τῇ κτίσει μεταδιδόμενον, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔχον τὴν ὑπαρξιν (*Hom. in Sabb. S.* n. 4).

² Εἰκὼν τοῦ Πατρὸς ὁ Υἱός, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα (*De Fide Orthodox.* i. 13).

³ Τοῦ Πατρὸς προερχομένην καὶ ἐν τῷ Λόγῳ ἀναπανομένην καὶ αὐτοῦ αὔσαν ἐκφαντικὴν δύναμιν (*De Fide Orthodox.* i. 7). Πατὴρ διὰ Λόγου προβολεὺς ἐκφαντορικοῦ Πνεύματος (*Ibid.* i. 12.)

⁴ Τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐνυπόστατον ἐκπόρευμα καὶ πρόβλημα ἐκ Πατρὸς μὲν, Υἱοῦ δέ, καὶ μὴ ἐξ Υἱοῦ, ὡς Πνεῦμα στόματος Θεοῦ, Λόγου ἐξαγγελτικόν (*De Hymno Trisag.* n. 28).

⁵ Μέσον τοῦ ἀγεννήτου καὶ γεννητοῦ, καὶ δι' Υἱοῦ τῷ Πατρὶ συναπτόμενον (*De Fide Orthodox.* i. 13). The above translation is incorrect. It should be: 'The Holy Ghost is neither unbegotten nor begotten, and is linked to the Father by the Son.'

Ἁγίου σου Πνεύματος καὶ τέλειον ἀνάδειξον δοῦλόν σου ἐν πᾶσιν εὐαρεστοῦντά σοι καὶ ἀξίως πολιτευόμενον τῆς δωρηθείσης αὐτῷ ὑπὸ τῆς σῆς προγνωστικῆς δυνάμεως μεγάλης ταύτης ἱερατικῆς τιμῆς.

Αὐτὸς Κύριε καὶ τοῦτον ὃν εὐδόκησας τὸν τοῦ Πρεσβυτερίου ὑπεισηλθεῖν βαθμὸν πλήρωσον τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου σου Πνεύματος δωρεάς· ἵνα γένηται ἄξιος παρεστάναι ἀμέμπτως τῷ Θυσιαστηρίῳ σου, κηρύσσειν τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας σου, ἱεουργεῖν τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας σου, προσφέρειν σοι δῶρα καὶ θυσίας πνευματικάς, ἀνακαινίζειν τὸν λαόν σου διὰ τῆς τοῦ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας.

Receive the Holy Ghost, for the Office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven : And whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God, and of his Holy Sacraments ; In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.¹

2. Bishop.

Αὐτός, Δέσποτα τῶν ἀπάντων, καὶ τοῦτον τὸν ψηφισθέντα καὶ ἀξιωθέντα ὑπεισελθεῖν τὸν εὐαγγελικὸν ζυγόν, καὶ τὴν ἀρχιερατικὴν ἀξίαν, διὰ τῆς χειρὸς ἐμοῦ τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ καὶ τῶν συμπαρόντων Λειτουργῶν καὶ Συνεπισκόπων, τῇ ἐπιφοιτήσει καὶ δυνάμει καὶ χάριτι τοῦ ἁγίου σου Πνεύματος ἐνίσχυσον, κτλ.

Receive the Holy Ghost, for the Office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands, In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen. And remember that thou stir up the Grace of God which is given thee, by this imposition of our hands : For God hath not given us the spirit of fear : but of power, and love, and soberness.²

¹ These are the words used at the laying on of hands ; they are preceded by the prayers ' Almighty God, giver of all good things ' and ' Almighty God and heavenly Father '.

² These words are preceded in the service by three prayers, ' Almighty God, who by thy Son ', ' Almighty God, giver of all good things ', and ' Almighty God and most merciful Father '.

18. Declaration of Faith

[Prepared by a Committee of the English Church Union and approved by the President and Council of that Body. First published in the *Church Times* of May 26, 1922, with a preliminary list of fifty-six signatures including Rev. H. P. Bull, S.S.J.E., the Dean of Chester, the Archdeacon of Chesterfield, Rev. E. Hermitage Day, D.D., Rev. J. A. Douglas, Rev. H. J. Fynes-Clinton, Bishop Gore, D.D., Canon T. A. Lacey, Canon Newbolt, Rev. L. Pullan, D.D., Rev. F. W. Puller, S.S.J.E., Canon Darwell Stone, D.D., the Dean of Winchester and others. The total number of those who ultimately signed was 3,715. The Declaration was subsequently translated into the Greek, Russian, Roumanian, Serbian, and Latin languages (see *The Christian East*, July 1922). The original draft of the Declaration appears in *The Relations of the Anglican Churches with the Eastern Orthodox* by J. A. Douglas (Faith Press, London, 1921), pages 90-3.]

(May 1922)

TO HIS HOLINESS THE OECUMENICAL PATRIARCH AND THE
HOLY SYNOD OF THE GREAT CHURCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE

We, the undersigned, being priests of the English Church, earnestly desiring to promote an understanding with our brethren of the Eastern-Orthodox Churches, and rejoicing that in God's providence there are manifold evidences of the growth of sympathy and mutual love on both sides, now in all humility write to your Holiness and to the Holy Synod, in order to set forth plainly that which we hold to be the genuine teaching of the English Church on certain matters of faith, touching which we gather from the utterances of Eastern-Orthodox hierarchs and theologians that they would welcome some explicit statement from us.

I. We affirm that the one saving faith, in which it is the will of God that all Christians should be held together in the unity of the spirit and the bond of peace, is the faith of the undivided Church of Christ, which faith is set forth in the Holy Scriptures, has been handed on by the Holy Fathers in their writings and by the tradition of the Church,

and in opposition to the negations and corruptions of heretics has been reaffirmed and safeguarded by Oecumenical Councils through the operation of the Holy Ghost.

2. We affirm that, notwithstanding individual departures therefrom, this faith has not been forsaken by the English Church.

3. We affirm that each particular Church is rightly independent (*autokephalos*) and self-administered (*autodiotikos*) in matters which are not essential to the faith or practice of the Universal Church.

4. We hold that an Oecumenical Council is the supreme tribunal of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, and that the dogmatic decrees of the Councils which have been accepted as Oecumenical by the Whole Church are incontrovertible and binding on all Christians.

5. As touching any matters in which the Church of England may seem in the opinion of Eastern theologians to have departed from the dogmatic decrees of the Oecumenical Councils, we declare that we know of no such departure, and that we accept the faith as expounded by those Councils.

6. Though the number of the Sacraments has not been formally fixed either by tradition from the Apostles or by any decision of an Oecumenical Council, we agree that in Baptism, the Eucharist, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Unction some special and appropriate grace is given by God to man as ordained either by Christ or by His Apostles acting on the authority which He gave them; and we adhere to the custom of calling these seven rites specifically sacraments.

7. We affirm the essential necessity of the Sacrament of Order according to the institution of Christ, the practice of the Apostles, and the constant tradition of the Church. This is secured in the Churches of the Anglican Communion by the transmission of the several orders of the hierarchy by the imposition of the hands of the bishops, to whom it

has been transmitted in like manner by an uninterrupted succession from the days of the Apostles.

We, the undersigned, therefore, hold that our Lord, through the ministry of the successors of the Apostles, has conferred on us and on all the members of the clergy of the Anglican Communion the Sacrament of the Order, with the purpose that we, who are priests, should (a) preach and teach the word of God ; (b) offer the unbloody sacrifice of the Eucharist for both the living and the departed ; (c) sacramentally absolve sinners who repent and confess their sins ; and (d) otherwise minister to the flock of Christ according to the ancient faith and practice of the Universal Church.

8. We affirm that, by consecration in the Eucharist, the bread and the wine, being blessed by the life-giving power of the Holy Spirit, are changed and become the true body and the true blood of Christ, and as such are given to and received by the faithful. We hold, therefore, that Christ thus present is to be adored. As to the actual manner of the change, and of the mode of the presence, no doctrine on this point is laid down by any Oecumenical Council, and therefore, while believing the fact, we do not venture to define the mode. There is here a divine mystery which passes human understanding.

9. We agree with the Holy Orthodox Eastern Church that honour should be given to the holy and ever-virgin Mother of God and the Saints departed ; that there is a legitimate use of sacred images ; and that, alike in our public and in our private prayers, we should ask for the benefit of the intercession of the saints.

10. We account the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion as a document of secondary importance concerned with local controversies of the sixteenth century, and to be interpreted in accordance with the faith of that Universal Church of which the English Church is but a part.

19. Constantinople and Anglican Ordinations

LETTER OF THE OECUMENICAL PATRIARCH TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

[The Archbishop of Canterbury in officially communicating the two following documents to Canterbury Convocation on February 16, 1923, pointed out that to become an oecumenical act the formal acceptance of Anglican Ordinations would have to be endorsed by all Patriarchates and other independent autocephalous Churches severally, or by a General Council. He further stated that the Declaration did not by itself authorize intercommunion or mutual ministrations. 'The importance', he said, 'lies in the preparation thus made by the Declaration for future advances,' and 'in preparing the way for the possible regularization of Anglican ministrations to their [i. e. Orthodox] people, or of the offer of ministrations on their part.']

Most Reverend Archbishop of Canterbury and Chief Hierarchy of all England, Brother, beloved and yearned for in Christ our God, Lord Randall, greetings ; your Reverence well beloved by us, fraternally in the Lord, we address you with gladness.

Our special committee dealing with the Union of the Churches has drawn our attention and that of our Holy Synod to the question of the validity of Anglican ordinations from the Orthodox point of view, for that it would be profitable in regard to the whole question of union that the opinion of the Holy Orthodox Church should be known upon this matter.

Accordingly the Holy Synod on this opportunity taking under our presidency the matter under consideration, and, having examined it from every point of view, has concluded that, as before the Orthodox Church, the ordinations of the Anglican Episcopal Confession of bishops, priests, and deacons, possesses the same validity as those of the Roman, Old Catholic, and Armenian Churches possess, inasmuch as all essentials are found in them which are held indispensable from the Orthodox point of view for the recognition of the

'Charisma' of the priesthood derived from Apostolic Succession.

Indeed, on the one hand, it is plain that there is as yet no matter here of a decree by the whole Orthodox Church. For it is necessary that the rest of the Orthodox Churches should be found to be of the same opinion (in the matter) as the Most Holy Church of Constantinople.

But even so it is an event not without significance that the Synod of one, and that the Primatial Throne of the Orthodox Churches, when taking the matter into consideration, has come to this conclusion.

Therefore with great joy we communicate the matter to Your beloved Grace as the Chief Hierarchy of the whole Anglican Church, being sure that your Grace will be equally favourably disposed towards this conclusion, as recognizing in it a step forward in that work of general union which is dear to God.

May the Heavenly Father grant unto us to be of the same mind, through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is blessed for ever and ever.

July 28, 1922.

Your well-beloved Grace's beloved brother in Christ, and altogether well disposed,

✠ MELETIOS OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

[For this exact translation the Metropolitan of Thyateira, Germanos.]

20. Encyclical on Anglican Ordinations

FROM THE OECUMENICAL PATRIARCH TO THE PRESIDENTS
OF THE PARTICULAR EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCHES

(August 1922).

The Most Holy Church of Constantinople, kindled from the beginning with zeal for universal union, and always keeping in mind the Lord's words prayed by Him to His heavenly Father just before His Saving Passion, has always

followed with keen interest every movement in the separated Churches, and has examined with care and study their every and any expression of faith which might point towards a *rapprochement* with Orthodoxy. Further, it has concluded with real joy that amongst them the Church, which has manifested the most lively desire to remove the obstacles towards a *rapprochement*, and, indeed, to full union with the Orthodox Church, is the Episcopal Anglican Church, which herself, having first received the light of Christianity from the East, has never ceased to remember the East, and to account as an important end a sincere *rapprochement* towards a full union in Christ Jesus with the Orthodox in the East.

Therefore the great Church of Christ (now) under our presidency, necessarily honouring the readiness of this Church in former periods, and especially in the last twenty years, entered into many sincere brotherly relations with it, and recently established a special committee, with instructions to report upon the still existing points of difference on the basis of a scientific inquiry, and on the method of their removal, with a view to accomplishing a full union of the two Churches in the same Orthodox Christian spirit.

Perceiving in its labour that on an important question—namely, the validity of Anglican ordinations—the Holy Orthodox Church had not yet officially delivered any opinion either as a whole or through any of the particular Holy Synods, although there have been many discussions on the matter from time to time among her theologians, and that an authoritative investigation and canonical solution of this important question would greatly facilitate the desired union by removing one of the more serious obstacles that oppose the goal of reunion which is sought on either side, and is dear to God, the Committee brought under the judgement of our Holy Synod a special report scientifically treating the above-named question. Our

Holy Synod studied this report of the Committee in repeated sessions, and took note :

1. That the ordination of Matthew Parker as Archbishop of Canterbury by four bishops is a fact established by history.

2. That in this ordination and those subsequent to it there are found in their fullness those orthodox and indispensable visible and sensible elements of valid episcopal ordination—namely, the laying on of hands and the *Epiklesis* of the All-Holy Spirit, and also the purpose to transmit the *charisma* of the Episcopal ministry.

3. That the Orthodox theologians who have scientifically examined the question have almost unanimously come to the same conclusions, and have declared themselves as accepting the validity of Anglican ordinations.

4. That the practice in the Church affords no indication that the Orthodox Church has ever officially treated the validity of Anglican Orders as in doubt in such a way as would point to the reordination of the Anglican clergy being regarded as required in the case of the union of the two Churches.

5. That expressing this general mind of the Orthodox Church the Most Holy Patriarchs at different periods and other Hierarchs of the East, when writing to the Archbishops of the Anglican Church, have been used to address them as ' Most Reverend Brother in Christ ', thus giving them a brotherly salutation.

Our Holy Synod, therefore, came to an opinion accepting the validity of the Anglican priesthood, and has determined that its conclusion should be announced to the other Holy Orthodox Churches, in order that opportunity might be given them also to express their opinion, so that through the decisions of the parts the mind of the whole Orthodox world on this important question might be known.

Accordingly, writing to your well-beloved [Beatitude] and informing you of the considerations which, in this question,

prevail with us, we have no doubt that your [Beatitude] also investigating this question with your Holy Synod, will be pleased to communicate the result of your consideration to us, with a view to a further improvement of our relations in regard to union with the Anglican Church, in the good hope that the Heavenly Ruler of the Church will supply that which is lacking through His all-strengthening grace, and will guide all who believe in Him to a full knowledge of the truth and to full union, that there may be formed of them one flock under a Chief Shepherd—the true Shepherd of the sheep, our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be the glory for ever. Amen.

21. Anglican Ordinations

LETTER TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY FROM THE PATRIARCH OF JERUSALEM

(February 1923)

To His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, First Hierarch of all England, our most beloved and dear brother in our Lord Jesus, Lord Randall. Greeting fraternally your beloved Grace, we have the pleasure to address you the following :

Yesterday we dispatched to your Grace the following telegram : ‘ We have pleasure inform your Grace that Holy Synod of our Patriarchate, after studying in several meetings question Anglican Orders from Orthodox point view, resolved their validity.’ To-day, explaining this telegram, we inform your Grace that the Holy Synod, taking the opportunity provided by the resolution passed some time ago by the Church of Constantinople, which is the Church having the First Throne of the Orthodox Churches, after examining this question under our presidency from all its aspects, resolved that the consecrations of bishops and ordinations of priests and deacons of the

Anglican Episcopal Church are considered by the Orthodox Church as having the same validity which the orders of the Roman Church have, because there exist all the elements which are considered necessary from an Orthodox point of view for the recognition of the grace of Holy Order from Apostolic Succession.

We have great pleasure in communicating to your Grace, as the First Hierarchy of all the Anglican Churches, this resolution of our Church, which constitutes a progress in the work, pleasing to God, of the union of all Churches, and we pray God to grant to your Grace many years full of health and salvation.

✠ DAMIANOS OF JERUSALEM.

Jerusalem.

February 27 / March 12, 1923.

22. *Anglican Ordinations*

LETTER TO THE OECUMENICAL PATRIARCH FROM THE
ARCHBISHOP OF CYPRUS

(1923)

YOUR HOLINESS,

Responding readily to the suggestion made in your reverend Holiness's letter of August 18, 1922, that the Church under our presidency should give its opinion as to the validity of Anglican Ordinations, we have placed the matter formally before our Holy Synod in formal session.

After full consideration thereof, it has reached the following conclusion.

It being apprehended that the Apostolic Succession in the Anglican Church was not broken in the Sacrament of Orders at the consecration of the first Archbishop in this Church, Matthew Parker, and the sensible signs by which the grace of the Holy Spirit, which enables the man ordained for the

duties of his particular order, being found in Orders among the Anglicans, there is no obstacle to the recognition by the Orthodox Church of the validity of Anglican Ordinations in the same way that the Ordinations of the Roman, the Old Catholic and the Armenian Churches are recognized.

Inasmuch as clergy entering the bosom of the Orthodox Church from these Churches are received without re-ordination, we declare our judgement that the same should hold good in the case of Anglicans ; while *intercommunio* (Sacramental Unity) by which any person would be able indiscriminately to receive the Sacraments at the hands of an Anglican, even though he adhere to the Orthodox dogma, is reserved until such time as dogmatic union between the two Churches, Orthodox and Anglican, is brought about.

Submitting this opinion of our Church to your Holiness,

We remain, with love, the least of your
brethren in Christ,

✠ CYRIL OF CYPRUS.

March 7/20, 1923.

V. THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

23. *The National Assembly of the Church of England*

RESOLUTION ON THE LAMBETH APPEAL

NOVEMBER 18, 1920

That the Assembly welcomes 'The Appeal to All Christian People' issued by the Bishops assembled in the Lambeth Conference, and earnestly hopes that preliminary steps may be taken to initiate Conferences on the proposals therein set forth.

24. *Convocation of Canterbury, Upper House*

RESOLUTION ON THE LAMBETH APPEAL

FEBRUARY 24, 1921

That the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury at this, its first Session after the Lambeth Conference of 1920, desires formally to welcome the 'Appeal to all Christian People' and calls attention to the important Resolutions, Nos. 10 to 31, appended to the Appeal.

25. *Convocation of York, Upper House*

RESOLUTION, FEBRUARY 23, 1921

That this House gives its approval to Resolution 12 A (i) of the Lambeth Conference, viz. 'That a Bishop is justified in giving occasional authorization to ministers, not episcopally ordained, who in his judgement are working towards

an ideal of union such as is described in our Appeal, to preach in churches within his Diocese, and to clergy of the Diocese to preach in the churches of such ministers.'

And expresses its hope that Diocesan Bishops will give effect to the Resolution, with due regard to the safeguards it contains.

26. Convocation of York, Lower House

FEBRUARY 23, 1921

The above Resolution (25) was carried in the Lower House of York Convocation with four dissentients, after the following rider had been carried by a large majority :

'That this House gives its approval to Resolution 12 B (i) of the Conference as follows :

'Believing, however, that certain lines of action might imperil both the attainment of its ideal and the unity of its own Communion, the Conference declares that it cannot approve of general schemes of intercommunion or exchange of pulpits.'

27. Convocation of Canterbury, Upper House

RESOLUTION, APRIL 27, 1921

That this House gives its approval to the following Resolutions adopted by the Lambeth Conference with reference to Reunion :

'12. (A) In view of prospects and projects of Reunion—

'(i) A Bishop is justified in giving occasional authorization to ministers, not episcopally ordained, who in his judgement are working towards an ideal of union such as is described in our Appeal,

to preach in churches within his Diocese, and to clergy of the Diocese to preach in the churches of such ministers :'

and expresses its hope that Diocesan Bishops in the Province will give effect to the Resolution with due regard to the safeguards which it contains.

' 12. (B) (i) It cannot approve of general schemes of intercommunion or exchange of pulpits,' 'believing that such lines of action might imperil both the attainment of its ideal and the unity of its own Communion.'

28. *Convocation of Canterbury, Lower House*

JULY 6, 1921

The Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury concurred with the Resolution (27) passed in the Upper House, by 83 votes to 77.

RIDER, JULY 7, 1921

The Lower House added the following Rider to this Resolution by 91 votes to 45 :

'That this House respectfully requests the President and Members of the Upper House to consider the limitation of any authorization under Clause 12 A (i) to occasions other than, and apart from, the regular services of the Church.'

29. *Convocation of York, Upper House*

RESOLUTION ON CHRISTIAN REUNION, FEBRUARY 15, 1922

1. That upon special occasions of public importance, or in gatherings for common devotion and mutual edification, members of Christian communions separated from the Church of England may, from time to time, be invited by

the incumbent to join in speaking and in offering prayer in consecrated buildings, provided :

- (a) That in all cases what is so done is outside the regular and appointed services of the Church ;
- (b) That before any invitation is issued by the incumbent, the consent of the Bishop has been in each case previously obtained.

2. That, similarly, clergy of the Church of England may accept invitations to take part in services other than those of the Church, provided,

- (a) That such services are of a special character and not part of the ordinary worship of other communions ;
- (b) That the approval of the Bishop has been first obtained ;
- (c) That in parishes other than their own the incumbent has first given his consent.

Lower House

FEBRUARY 16, 1922

This Resolution was submitted to the Lower House and the following Resolution was carried by a large majority :

That the scheme be welcomed as a whole.

VI. THE FREE CHURCHES IN ENGLAND AND THE LAMBETH APPEAL

30. The Baptist Union

RESOLUTION OF THE ANNUAL ASSEMBLY, APRIL 27, 1921

In receiving the Report¹ of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England with reference to the Lambeth Appeal, the Assembly of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland recognizes the guidance of the Spirit of God in the present movement towards Christian Unity. The Assembly feels that the movement has received a great impulse from the fraternal and sympathetic spirit of the Lambeth Conference, and especially in the idea of fellowship, which runs through all the work of the Lambeth Conference, and in the acknowledgment that 'all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity share membership in the Universal Church of Christ, which is His Body'.

The Assembly thanks His Grace the Archbishop of York for his visit to the Third Session on Tuesday, April 26th, and for his exposition of the Appeal. The Assembly generally endorses the Report of the Federal Council as expressing the common view and attitude of the Evangelical Free Churches of England, and appreciates the great service rendered to the Free Churches in the preparation of the Report. It requests the Federal Council to continue their work with a view to a better understanding between the Churches and the removal of such obstacles as still remain.

31. The Presbyterian Church of England

RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, MAY 5, 1921

The Assembly receives with respect, and welcomes with cordiality, the Appeal of the Lambeth Conference on the subject of the reunion of Christendom ; and, with a deep

¹ See *The Free Churches and the Lambeth Appeal* No. 41 *infra*.

sense of the greatness and of the urgency of the issues, gives thanks to God that Christian people are being drawn together in the unity of the Spirit and of the Body of Christ. The Assembly declares its willingness to confer with representatives of the Anglican Church on the whole question of Reunion.

The Assembly also receives with appreciation the valuable Report on the Lambeth Appeal issued under the auspices of the Federal Council of Evangelical Free Churches of England ; and it expresses its indebtedness to the Committee of the Council for the preparation of this Statement. The Assembly associates itself generally with the positions stated therein in the name of the Free Churches.

The Assembly, in reappointing its representatives on the Federal Council, authorizes them (1) to appoint delegates to confer with representatives of the Anglican Church either in conjunction with the Free Church Federal Council or separately ; (2) to co-opt for this end other members of the Assembly if this be considered advisable. It also counsels the Committee in the matter to act in such co-operation with other Churches of the Presbyterian Order as may be found desirable.

The Assembly, believing that the Spirit of God is leading the Churches in this high matter, earnestly commends the whole question to the thoughts and the prayers of all believing people, that the will of the Lord regarding His Church may be made known, and that grace may be given to us all to follow it.

32. The Congregational Union

RESOLUTION OF THE ANNUAL ASSEMBLY, MAY 10, 1921

That we, the members of the Congregational Union of England and Wales in session assembled, in acknowledging the receipt of the Appeal of the Lambeth Conference desire to express to the Archbishop our sincere appreciation of the spirit that breathes through the Appeal. We share with the

Bishops the desire for a closer fellowship among Christ's people, and we assure the Archbishop that we shall labour together with him and with them to bring about the happy consummation when 'they all shall be one'. Several reasons, however, prevent us from accepting the definite proposals made in the Lambeth Appeal. Our broad position is set forth in the response made by the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches—with which document we hereby record our general agreement. We believe with the other Churches therein represented that union is only possible on the basis of a frank acknowledgement of the full validity of one another's ministries, and we agree that the approach to union must be along the lines of intercommunion and interchange of pulpits. More acutely, however, than our sister Free Churches do we—owing to our historic witness in favour of the continuous guidance of the Spirit and the consequent freedom of faith—feel the difficulty caused by insistence upon a formulated creed as a condition of union. We hold firmly and loyally the faith once for all delivered to the saints, but we believe that under the guidance of the Spirit, the expression of that faith may and must vary from age to age. Our belief in that same freedom of the spirit deepens also our difficulty in assenting to the necessity of the Episcopate and renders it impossible for us to assent to any form of Church establishment interfering as we believe it does with the Church's full spiritual liberty. But while we share in the difficulties expressed in the Free Church Report, and have difficulties of our own in addition, we desire to keep open the door of conference and negotiation in the hope that misunderstandings may be removed and prejudices dissolved, and that as a consequence the way may be prepared for a realization of that unity the vision of which we too greet and to which we would not be disobedient. In the meantime we heartily join in beseeching God's blessing upon the whole estate of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, and we pray that as there is one

God and Father of us all who is above all and through all and in all, so we may henceforth be all of one heart and one soul, united in one holy bond of truth and peace, of faith and charity.

33. The Primitive Methodist Church

RESOLUTION OF THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE,
JUNE 15-23, 1921

It is with profound gratitude to Almighty God that this Conference received the appeal for the visible unity of the Church of Jesus Christ, as issued by the 200 Bishops of the Episcopal Church at the recent Lambeth Conference. With thanksgiving to the great Head of the Church, we welcome the cordial and manifestly sincere appeal which they send forth to all Churches, recognizing their labours in the Kingdom of our Lord and making frank recognition of the membership of non-episcopal Churches in the universal Church of Jesus Christ, which is His body. The validity and fruitfulness of the Free Church ministry have unreserved acknowledgement, and testimony is borne by them to the rich elements of truth, liberty, and life, which but for our witness would have been 'obscured and neglected'. The significance of the appeal lies also in the recognition that the Episcopate is but one method, though a tried and venerable one, in the Government of the Church. The requirement in the Appeal that Free Church ministers, though already ordained in their own respective Churches, should submit themselves to a further ordination at the hands of Episcopal Bishops, cannot be conceded by our Church. It, at least, needs much elucidation. This Primitive Methodist Conference associates itself in general with the reply sent by the Federal Council of the Free Churches. The realization of this spiritual vision of one corporate Church may yet be far removed from us, but we are convinced that it is of the mind of God. We are

deeply impressed also by the sincerity and Christian attitude thus expressed by this historic and honoured Church of the Protestant Reformation. We express the hope that the representatives of all the British Churches may be called together for fellowship in prayer and consideration of the proposals sent forth, and pray that the immediate outcome may be in closer co-operation in the clamant need of evangelizing the people, and in securing justice, morality, and goodwill among all classes.

The Primitive Methodist Church heartily reciprocates the generous goodwill which breathes throughout the encyclical, and prays for the day when the union of hearts inherent in all those who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and in truth may become more manifest in the fellowship of worship and of redemptive toil for the world.

34. The United Methodist Church

RESOLUTION OF THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE, JULY 15, 1921

1. That this Conference receives with grateful appreciation from the Archbishop of Canterbury a copy of the Encyclical Letter from Bishops of the Anglican Church at the Lambeth Conference of 1920.

2. It learns therefrom of the intense desire for Christian Reunion which was manifest at the Conference, and which is expressed in the Appeal to all Christian people.

3. It is profoundly impressed by the spirit and tone of that address, and would desire to respond in a spirit no less gracious and Christian. Our Church has always cherished the Catholic ideal, and has itself illustrated by corporate Union of three Methodist Communities that such action can sometimes be accomplished without any sacrifice of vital principles.

4. It will therefore be prepared to enter into the fraternal Conference suggested by the Archbishop of Canterbury and will appoint representatives for that purpose.

5. It is constrained to add, without, it trusts, in any degree deviating from the spirit of the foregoing Resolutions, but because candour is absolutely essential to create the suitable atmosphere for discussion, that there are ideas and principles for which their Church has always stood which they can in no case surrender, and that some of these are challenged in the Appeal itself, though in language the frankness and courtesousness of which this Conference gratefully acknowledges.

6. That the Conference is in general accord with the reply of the Representative Committee of the Free Churches.

7. That the Conference records its belief that, whatever may be the results of a practical kind of any Conference that may be held, the effect of the Anglican Appeal can only be to make the relations of the Churches to each other more nearly according to the mind of the Master.

35. The Wesleyan Methodist Church

RESOLUTION OF THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE, JULY 16, 1921

The Conference receives with cordial acknowledgement the letter of the Archbishop of Canterbury, enclosing a copy of the Report of the recent Lambeth Conference, and calling special attention to 'The Appeal to All Christian People'. It looks forward with hopeful anticipation to an early opportunity of such effective fraternal conference as the Archbishop suggests.

The Conference also expresses its grateful appreciation of the visit of His Grace the Archbishop of York and of his clear and impressive exposition of the Lambeth Appeal.

It rejoices in the spirit of the message of which the Archbishop was the bearer, and to that message will give careful and prayerful consideration, ever ready to welcome practical suggestions for united fellowship alike in thought and word, in work and worship.

36. The Wesleyan Methodist Church

REPLY TO THE APPEAL TO ALL CHRISTIAN PEOPLE
ADOPTED BY THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE,
JULY 1922

TO HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

WE, Ministers and Laymen of the Wesleyan Methodist Church assembled at the Annual Conference at Sheffield in July 1922, desire cordially to acknowledge the 'Appeal to All Christian People' transmitted to us by your Grace a year ago. We listened with great appreciation to the Exposition given by the Archbishop of York, the spiritual force of which came home to all his hearers.

I. We are thankful to God for the proof afforded in the Appeal that the subject of the visible unity of the Church of Christ was impressed so deeply on the minds of the Bishops in the recent Lambeth Conference. We believe with them that the Holy Spirit was guiding their thoughts, as we trust He will graciously guide our own, in reference to a subject of such great and vital importance. We gratefully recognize the truly Christian spirit which pervades their message and we welcome with all our hearts the token thus given of an earnest desire to draw all Christian people closer together.

We who revere the memory of John Wesley and who by our origin and early traditions owe so much to the Church of England, would respond most heartily to this appeal and would express at the outset our desire to co-operate as far as possible in promoting the high aims which the Bishops have so frankly and so earnestly expressed. We too believe, in the words of the Appeal, that 'God wills fellowship' and that it is His will that the true fellowship of all sincere Christians should be outwardly and clearly manifested to the world. We also deeply deplore the broken unity which has

been only too long and too painfully visible in the Church relationships of fellow-Christians and we are increasingly sensible of the far-reaching evil effects of disunion. We would fain take our part in the work of healing the wounds of the Church of Christ and of repairing errors into which its dissevered sections have fallen in the past. We further believe that we are called to a larger conception of our Lord's purposes for the world through a united Church ; not only to a wider outlook and higher ideals, but to a new departure in practical effort. The critical conditions of society amidst which we live, the distraction and confusion of nations torn asunder by jealousy and fear, the mutual suspicions and conflicts which divide classes at home and abroad and the inadequacy of secular motives and remedies, present a challenge which the Christian Church may not evade yet cannot meet while it is divided against itself.

These clamant needs are acutely felt and widely recognized ; and the spontaneous and diverse movements towards reunion which are arising in various sections of the Church and in all parts of the world show that the times are ripe for combined action. It may well be considered that to hold back from active enterprise at this time would be afresh to grieve the Holy Spirit Himself, the one Giver of all true Christian unity and concord.

We note with satisfaction the reference made in your Committee's report to the movements now in progress for a closer union of religious Communions separated from the Church of England. One of these is the effort now being made by the British Methodist Churches to effect organic union. We greatly appreciate your Committee's expression of their desire to associate themselves with ' the spirit and hopes ' of this and all similar movements and your hearty desire for their success.

II. Following out the lines of thought for the promotion

of this 'adventure of goodwill and still more of faith', suggested in the Appeal, we reply that,

1. We reverently accept the Holy Scriptures, interpreted from age to age by the Spirit of truth, as a record of Divine revelation and rule of faith and conduct.

2. We acknowledge the Apostles' Creed as a very early baptismal confession of belief and the Creed commonly called Nicene as a statement of Christian faith upon certain fundamental truths, and, while claiming a reasonable liberty of interpretation, we heartily accept the substance of the teaching contained in both these venerable symbols.

3. We believe that two Sacraments were instituted for His Church by Christ Himself, viz., Baptism and the Lord's Supper ; and that, while there may be difference of opinion concerning them as signs and seals of Divine grace, they have been Divinely appointed for the expression of 'the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ'.

4. It is when we come to questions of constitution and government of the Church that our differences are more acute and call for more patient inquiry. And this inquiry should, we believe, take place in the presence of one another, and with the utmost frankness. Meanwhile we gladly note that in more than one passage of the Appeal it is recognized that the ministries of Churches which do not possess the Episcopate 'have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace'. We accept the assurance that the suggestions now made are not intended to imply on the part of any one a repudiation of his spiritual ancestry or of past experience of spiritual blessing ; that no absorption of any one communion by another is contemplated but rather the 'preservation of various treasures of faith and order, possessed in common and made serviceable to the whole Body of Christ'.

In our opinion these are factors of the greatest importance to be taken into account in any attempt to secure any kind,

or measure, of Christian Reunion. But we are bound to state at the same time our own fundamental conviction that neither in Our Lord's own teaching, nor in any part of the New Testament, is one form of Church polity prescribed as essential to the Church; and that no particular form of ministry can claim the 'direct commission of Christ', or of His Apostles, as giving to it an authority to which no others are entitled. We gladly recognize the value of the Episcopate, especially at certain epochs of Church history, as one form of organization for the well-being of the Church. In fact, to-day, in the United States of America Methodist Episcopal Churches number several millions of members.

5. But the question whether it is desirable to aim at one corporate organic union, implying a measure of uniformity of Church government and the adoption of the episcopate as the one indispensable means of providing a ministry universally acceptable—as suggested in certain passages of the Appeal and other parts of the Lambeth Conference Report—is one which obviously needs careful and prolonged investigation.

The answer depends upon determination of several serious issues, upon which it would be out of place to enter in this Reply, but which we cannot pass by in silence. For example :

(a) The proposal to make episcopal ordination an essential part of the scheme of union, if it be interpreted as implying re-ordination, could not be accepted by those who believe themselves to be already ministers in the Church of God.

At least a clearer exposition of the meaning of some passages in the Appeal on this fundamental subject is needed.

(b) An examination of what is meant by a 'representative and constitutional' episcopate, and how it is to be secured, is a closely related topic.

(c) A specially important subject is the attitude to be

adopted towards those who cannot accept the episcopal form of government as an essential feature in the Catholic Church of Christ. We could not under any circumstances consent to limit the freedom of fellowship which we already enjoy with non-episcopalian Churches.

(d) The position and functions of lay preachers—a large and important element in all Methodist Churches—claim careful consideration, as well as the position of the laity generally in the constitution of the Church.

(e) The difficulties raised by a connexion between Church and State form an important consideration.

(f) We feel it necessary to affirm the adherence of the Wesleyan Methodist Church to the principles of the Protestant Reformation.

III. But we are heartily in accord with the spirit and general aim of the Bishops as set forth in this memorable Appeal. We fully recognize the tentative character of many of the suggestions made—that the Appeal itself does not put forward any specific programme, but rather describes a goal to be reached, if possible, and invites co-operation in an attempt to realize it.

We gladly declare our readiness to join in exploring the ground and in opening up every avenue of possibility in a great enterprise, which can only be undertaken in humble reliance upon the power and guidance of the Spirit of God. We, in common with the Bishops who have addressed us, desire earnestly to discover how far unity in diversity may be secured by the long separated—and sometimes, it is to be feared, mutually hostile—sections of the Church of our One Saviour and Lord.

We heartily welcome the suggestion that, wherever it has not already been done, Councils representing all Church Communions should be formed as centres of united effort to promote physical, moral, and social welfare and the extension of the rule of Christ among all nations and over

every region of human life. Above all things it will be necessary to strive after more complete mutual understanding and to cultivate the spirit of goodwill.

For our own part we should welcome at once a closer fellowship at the Table of the Lord and a regulated interchange of pulpits as a fitting preparation for any more complete union that may be ultimately possible.

But we desire to follow wherever the Divine Spirit leads us, that we may take some part in 'the great endeavour to recover and manifest to the world' the meaning of that complete Christian unity which Our Lord intended His people to enjoy and impart to all mankind. We believe that only thus can the work of His Church on earth be adequately accomplished and the whole world be won to His allegiance and sway.

We pray that grace, mercy, and peace may be with you and all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.

JOHN E. WAKERLEY, *President*.
THOMAS KIRKUP, *Secretary*.

37, 38. *The Moravian Church or Unitas Fratrum*

[Following upon Resolutions 29 and 30 of the Lambeth Conference, 1920, the Archbishop of Canterbury reappointed the committee charged with negotiations with the Moravian Church, and communications are proceeding (1924). The reference in the first Resolution below is to the Resolutions of the General Synod of the Moravian Church held at Herrnhut 1909, in answer to Resolutions 70-3 of the Lambeth Conference, 1908.]

RESOLUTIONS OF THE BRITISH PROVINCIAL SYNOD JULY 1921

That Synod hereby records its grateful acknowledgement of the communication received from the Lambeth Conference, 1920, and its earnest desire that the continuance of negotiations may lead to closer communion with the

Anglican Community; that Synod further desires to reaffirm its adherence to the basis of union set out in the Resolutions of 1909, and requests the Anglican Relations Committee to emphasize this point in the negotiations.

That this Synod records its appreciation of the work of the Federal Council of Evangelical Free Churches, and in particular its gratitude for the efforts made by the Federal Council in the cause of Christian Unity; and that Synod express its earnest hope that the negotiations between the Free Churches and the Anglicans may be continued and may lead to a fuller mutual understanding and to a wider practical fellowship in Christian service.

38. RESOLUTION OF THE BRITISH PROVINCIAL SYNOD JULY 1923

That the Report on Relations with the Anglican Church be adopted and that Synod records its confidence in the manner in which our representatives have conducted the negotiations, and thanks them for their action.

39. *Free Catholics and the Lambeth Report*

[The Society of Free Catholics includes members of the Church of England as well as of the Free Churches, both at home and abroad.]

DECEMBER 1920

The Executive Council of the Society of Free Catholics welcome, with deep thanksgiving, the 'Lambeth Conference Report'.

As representing Free Catholics drawn from various parts of the Christian Church, at home and abroad, they wish to express their profound sense of the earnestness and generosity of the Bishops' Appeal and humbly to add:

1. That the spirit and intention of that Appeal ought to evoke from all Christians everywhere a like earnestness and generosity of purpose.

2. That we urge our Anglican brethren to carry out

without delay the recommendations of the Report (10, p. 29) that the authorities of the Anglican Communion should formally invite the authorities of other Churches within their areas to confer with them.

3. That we urge our Free Church brethren, especially such as are members of the Society of Free Catholics, to enter forthwith into such conferences if and when invited, notwithstanding any difficulties or objections that may present themselves in the Report.

4. That we hope our members everywhere will accept the basis of the Appeal as provisionally an adequate basis for discussion and negotiation without prejudice to matters whether of principle or of expediency that may require further explanation or modification.

5. That we reaffirm in the strongest possible way our conviction that the essentials of historical Catholicism and of Free Churchmanship can and ought to be reconciled.

6. That we unreservedly accept and would repeat as our own the words of the Appeal (p. 27). 'The vision which rises before us is that of a Church, genuinely Catholic, loyal to all Truth, and gathering into its fellowship all "who profess and call themselves Christians"', within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present, shall be possessed in common, and made serviceable to the whole body of Christ. Within this unity Christian Communion now separated from one another would retain much that has long been distinctive in their methods of worship and service. It is through a rich diversity of life and devotion that the unity of the whole fellowship will be fulfilled.'

W. E. ORCHARD, *President.*

J. M. LLOYD THOMAS, *Chairman.*

JOHN S. BURGESS, *Hon. Secretary.*

E. ELLIS TOWNLEY, *Hon. Treasurer.*

40. The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England, and The National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England

PROVISIONAL STATEMENT ON THE APPEAL

SEPTEMBER 1920

[The following Provisional Statement was issued on September 28, 1920, by the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England at their Annual Assembly and was endorsed by the National Free Church Council. It was thus issued under their joint authority.]

The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England, being the first Assembly of representatives duly elected by the Free Churches meeting since the Lambeth Conference, feels called upon to give consideration to the important pronouncement issued by the Anglican episcopate on the subject of Reunion.

The Council realizes the greatness and seriousness of the issues involved in this matter, which affects the whole future of religion in this country and beyond it. The Council has taken steps to set up a Committee representative of the constituent Churches, with instructions to submit the pronouncement of the Lambeth Conference, in so far as it bears on Reunion, to a careful examination in the light of the principles of the New Testament and the evangelical conception of the Church and the ministry, and to prepare a statement thereon for the consideration of the Council, with the view of transmitting the results of their examination to the Authorities of the Free Churches, on which will fall the duty of dealing with the whole question; and therefore it does not desire at present to record any final opinion or to anticipate what the judgement of the Churches may be.

But it feels warranted in declaring as follows:

1. The Council is humbly thankful to Almighty God for the place which the recovery of the visible unity of

the Church of Christ has in the minds and hearts of so many Christian people ; and it joins earnestly in the prayer that the spirit of Christian unity may continue to grow, and the expression of it be made increasingly manifest.

2. The Council recognizes and heartily reciprocates the brotherly and eirenical spirit which characterizes the Lambeth Appeal ; and it will seek continually to foster this spirit among the Churches, whatever differences of judgement may and must arise in the discussion of particular proposals. The Council is prepared to welcome many things in the Lambeth Document, which, it trusts, may be the beginning of new and happier relations between conformist and nonconformist Churches in England.

3. But, passing to the practical proposals contained therein, the Council, while finding itself in sympathy with much that is put forward by the Conference, is constrained in frankness to say that there are fundamental provisions in these proposals which do not command its assent. Before, however, pronouncing on these, the Council would be willing to discuss them with representatives of the Anglican Communion in order that no misapprehension may exist as to their meaning.

4. The Council eagerly welcomes everything in the Lambeth proposals which would further religious intercourse among the Churches, and it will respond to these in all available ways. Especially does the Council desire that those who belong to the one Lord should gather together at their Lord's Table.

The Council does not deem it necessary or advisable at the present stage to go into further discussion of this great issue ; it calls on all faithful people to whom it may address itself to give themselves to prayerful consideration of the

whole question, that He, Whose living Spirit is the supreme guide and final law of the Church, may lead us all in His way of truth and peace, and that it may be made manifest to the world that we are one in Him.

41. The Free Churches and the Lambeth Appeal

[This Report was prepared by the Joint Committee referred to in the Provisional Statement (No. 40). The Committee had the Rev. Dr. W. B. Selbie as Chairman and the Rev. Dr. P. Carnegie Simpson as Convener of the drafting Sub-Committee, and included Baptists, Congregationalists, Wesleyan Methodists, Presbyterians, Primitive Methodists, United Methodists, and one Moravian. The Federal Council received the Report and authorized its transmission to the Authorities of each of the federated denominations. The Report was published by the joint authority of the Federal Council and the National Free Church Council.]

MAY 22, 1921

I

When the Spirit of the Lord moves a sister Church, occupying a great place in this country and extending into many parts of the world, to appeal to Christendom on the subject of Reunion, and when the appeal is made with the sincerity and impressiveness of the recent declarations from Lambeth, such an approach is to be met not only with respect, but also with earnest and cordial welcome. The subject is a great one, and to-day it presses on the hearts and the consciences of Christian people as it has never pressed before. The Evangelical Free Churches of England share in the sense alike of its importance and of its urgency. Moreover, we recognize in the Lambeth Appeal a deep and grave concern over the evils of disunion, which we also feel. As Free Churchmen, we acknowledge that our concern over these evils has often been too slight, and we would learn from others who have felt it more profoundly. In now approaching the consideration of the far-reaching issues

raised by this communication, we desire to be freed from all prejudice, as also from any seeking of ends other than those which should be sought in Christ's Church and which may serve His Kingdom. We pray that His Spirit, who is the Spirit at once of truth and of charity, may be our guide.

It is not necessary to recall in more than the fewest words the circumstances out of which the question, in its present form, has arisen. The Conference of more than two hundred and fifty Bishops of the Anglican Communion, gathered from all parts of the world, which met at Lambeth last July, devoted special attention to the subject of the Reunion of Christendom. They not only deplored the broken fellowship and the unhappy divisions which so long have crippled the work of Christ's Church, as His appointed witness to the world, but declared that the times call for 'a new outlook and new measures'. 'Inspired by the vision and hope of a visible unity of the whole Church of Christ on earth,' they felt themselves called of the Holy Spirit to take a marked initial step in order to prepare the way for this manifestation to the world of our oneness in Christ Jesus our Lord. They issued *An Appeal to all Christian People*; and this, during the last six months, has stirred multitudes of Christian hearts.

A copy of this Appeal has, we understand, been sent by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the recognized authorities of the various Free Churches in England, and the subject will doubtless be brought before their several Assemblies or Conferences meeting in the course of this year. The Federal Council has no authority, nor has it any desire or intention, to frame a direct reply to this communication. Each church will take its own course and make its own response. But as all non-episcopal churches are alike vitally interested in this matter, and as the larger non-episcopal churches in England are officially represented in the Free Church Federation, the Federal Council, after

careful consideration, has thought it well that (in conjunction with the National Free Church Council)¹ a statement should be issued, for the information of the churches we represent, to recall and to express fundamental evangelical principles held by us in common, and their bearing on the present issue. These principles must determine our attitude to the Appeal and its practical proposals, and are, in our view, of vital importance at a time which may prove to be an epoch in the history of Christendom.

Before entering on this discussion, we would realize that the whole matter is more than one between our brethren of other branches of the Church and ourselves. It is a matter between all the churches and their Lord. The Church being His Church, it is His mind and His will which we must set before us to be our rule and guide. We must consult with Him even more than confer with each other. We have our various thoughts and plans about unity; He who loves His Church has His own thoughts of unity. If we all could but learn of Him, we should be at one.

II

We may begin by briefly summarizing the Lambeth proposals.

Three remarks may be made as to the general character of the scheme. One is that it is meant to secure, or to lead the way to securing a reunion of the whole of Christendom; and its details are to be read in the light of this catholic ideal. A second is that it seeks a unity which is not mere uniformity, but which shall preserve differing types of

¹ It may be useful to explain that the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches is a limited but representative body, consisting of delegates officially appointed by the Annual Assemblies and Conferences of the various Free Churches, and the National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches is a body consisting of delegates chosen from the local Free Church Councils, on which the various denominations are represented, and also of personal Members.

worship and polity under one faith and order. The third is that the Bishops have, in effect, abandoned their former standpoint, from which terms were laid down for the union of other churches with the Anglican Church. They now rather invite the co-operation of other churches in a common endeavour to recover the unity which has been lost. These general features we should recognize and appreciate.

From them we pass to the practical proposals of the scheme. And here it must be understood that, in the four paragraphs following, we are attempting to set forth not our own views, but the Bishops' presentation of their scheme.

The key-note is fellowship—'God wills fellowship'; and this is brought to us in and through Jesus Christ and His Spirit. But it is meant by Him to be also manifested in 'an outward visible and united society', having its common faith, its recognized officers, its Divine means of grace, and its vocation to the service of the Kingdom of God. That is what is meant by the Catholic Church. Such a fellowship is not visible to-day. We are in a condition of broken fellowship—organized into separate groups—and this divides the Body and delays the victory of the Kingdom. God is calling upon all the members of His Church on earth to 'an adventure of goodwill and of faith', towards the achievement of a reunited Catholic Church.

This ideal, it is submitted, will be found to involve the acceptance of the following fundamentals: (1) the Holy Scriptures and the Nicene Creed as respectively the ultimate standard and 'the sufficient statement of the Christian faith'; (2) the sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion; and (3) 'a ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body'.

Can the last of these essentials, it is asked, be secured on any other basis than that of episcopacy and episcopal

ordination? This is not said in order to call in question for a moment the 'spiritual reality' of ministries not having episcopal ordination. Moreover, it is proposed that episcopacy should be exercised in a representative and constitutional manner. But 'the truly equitable approach to union is by the way of mutual deference to one another's consciences'. So, to this end, the Anglican bishops and clergy, if terms of union were otherwise satisfactorily adjusted, would willingly accept from the authorities of other communions 'a form of commission or recognition', the hope being expressed that 'the same motive would lead ministers who have not received it, to accept a commission through episcopal ordination, as obtaining for them a ministry throughout the whole fellowship'. This would not mean that any man should be taken 'to repudiate his past ministry', it would be the public and formal seeking of 'additional recognition' for wider service in a reunited Church.

Certain directions or counsels are given (in Resolutions accompanying the Appeal) as to the *interim* stage while this scheme is in process of coming into existence. Approval cannot be given to general interchange of pulpits or intercommunion. There may be, however, 'occasional authorization' to ministers, not episcopally ordained, to preach, if the bishop considers that they are 'working towards' an ideal of union such as that described in the Appeal. And the Bishops 'will not question' the action of any of their number who, 'in the few years between the initiation and the completion of a definite scheme of union,' shall 'countenance the irregularity of admitting to Communion the baptized but unconfirmed communicants of the non-episcopal congregations concerned in the scheme'. These and other limitations are explained (in the *Sub-Committee's Report on Reunion with Non-Episcopal Churches*) as due to the conviction that a wider policy would 'obscure our

ideal and hinder its fulfilment', and also impair the 'enthusiastic unanimity' of its support within the Anglican communion.

The above is a brief but, we trust, an impartial and accurate reading of the Lambeth scheme as set forth in the Encyclical Letter from the Bishops with the accompanying Resolutions and Reports. We do not here enter into those parts of these documents which refer more particularly to the Roman, the Eastern, and other episcopal communions, though they have an important bearing alike on the form and on the contents of the Appeal.

III

Before proceeding to any statement of our position as regards the actual proposals in this scheme, we desire to put in the forefront the expression of our ready and whole-hearted response to the idea underlying it. This is, as has been said, the idea of fellowship. We believe that Christian people to-day are earnestly seeking more and closer Christian fellowship; it appeals to their minds, to their hearts, to their consciences. We feel that the religious separations and alienations often made by our ecclesiastical divisions contradict the whole thought of the Church of Christ which is His Body. We have one Saviour, one Master, one Lord. We all owe everything to Him. If we all love Him, we should together love Him; if we are all His servants, we should serve Him together. Therefore, with all our heart we long for and shall welcome religious fellowship with our brethren in Christ Jesus.

We not only say this, but also desire to act in the spirit of it. We gladly join with our Anglican fellow Christians—and indeed with all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity—not only in social and civic work, but also in common worship and in any form of religious fellowship which is open to us. And we must add that we desire with

sincere longing, as the supreme expression of Christian fellowship, the meeting together in the Holy Communion at that Table which, we must ever remind ourselves, does not belong to any of our churches, but is His, where He alone presides and to which He alone invites. We are aware that many of our Anglican brethren cannot see their way to meet us here. But our respect for their sincere conviction must not keep us from declaring ours—that the Lord's Table, because it is the Lord's, must, in the non-episcopal churches we represent, be open to our Anglican brethren, as to other fellow Christians, and that our religious fellowship will never be expressed as Christ means it to be till we meet in this most hallowed intercourse.

We do not dwell further on the call to fellowship except to add that it is not enough to enjoy this only among ourselves as churches. There is danger in the Church thinking of herself as her own end. We must labour to unite all Christian people together in the relationships of social and national life. Into this we cannot here enter; but it is a part of the ideal of the fellowship of Christ, and His Church should remember it and serve it.

To the idea of Church fellowship we shall return in the closing section of our statement.

IV

We now consider how and from what standpoint the Evangelical Free Churches of England should view this scheme and the practical proposals which it contains.

A movement towards union has, it seems to us, three stages; and these must be taken in order. There must be first of all the right spirit between churches—the spirit that is brotherly and desires union, that is free alike from suspicion and from self-seeking, that is both penitent and prayerful. In recent years a large measure of this spirit has

been attained between the conformist and non-conformist sections of English Christianity ; and it has been increased by the whole tone of the Lambeth Appeal and by the courtesy and friendliness of many episcopalian brethren. The second stage is not a scheme of practical proposals. That comes third. Prior to that, there must be a real agreement on what we may call postulates—that is, vital principles regarding the Church, and, still more, regarding the Gospel. This second stage is, it seems to us, passed over rather slightly in the Lambeth documents. It is of vital principles or postulates for which the Evangelical Free Churches stand that we must now speak. This is not done in any ‘denominational’ spirit ; the Appeal itself recognizes that all the communions concerned inherit what constitutes for them a sacred trust. Moreover, that of which we shall chiefly speak is not denominational, but simply Christian.

Our very name implies the positions on which we stand. We are *Churches*—claiming to be, in our corporate capacity, parts of the one Holy Catholic Church of Jesus Christ. We claim this, and cannot do less than claim it, because of our relation with Christ, who is the Head of the Body and who has recognized us and used us, not merely individually but corporately, for the ends of His Church. We are *Free Churches*—claiming liberty in all spiritual affairs that we may be free to listen to and obey Him whom we all acknowledge as our only Head. And we are *Evangelical Free Churches*. We use the word in no party sense. But there is, we believe, a definite New Testament Gospel, and this—which carries with it its conception of the Church—we cannot and dare not compromise for the sake even of union itself. This, indeed, is our supreme and, in a sense, sole principle, for it contains the others : the Church is the outcome of the Gospel—hence the importance which has

always been attached by evangelical churches to 'the preaching of the Word'—and the Church thus made by the Gospel must be free.

What then, for us, is the Gospel? And what is the bearing of that Gospel on the conception of the Church? We desire to answer these questions simply and clearly.

In the Gospel, Christ is proclaimed as the Power and the Wisdom of God unto salvation. This salvation is essentially a personal relation of the soul to God—a relation which is immediate, and is constituted by grace on God's part and by faith on man's. Through this Gospel, the Holy Spirit is shed abroad in the hearts of those that believe; and this common possession of the Spirit creates a fellowship in which the humblest and loneliest Christian is a fellow-citizen with all the saints. This fellowship, which is the Church, gives visible expression to its corporate life in common faith, order, and worship; and to it belongs the vocation of witnessing for Christ and of winning the world for Him and thus bringing in the Kingdom of God.

The essentials of the Church are, therefore, in the Gospel, not in organization. The former is that by which the Church is: the latter is something which the Church *has*—and, of course, the more perfectly she has it, the better. We value the organizations and institutions of the visible Church, and we seek a conception of the Church as large and lofty as the New Testament offers; but we cannot allow any church order or rite, or even the idea of the Church taken by itself, to displace the Gospel as the regulative and—under the Divine Spirit—the creative principle of all ecclesiastical doctrine and practice.✓

The position above stated carries with it another. The Spirit being given of God to all who receive the Gospel of Christ, so that all may thereby have personal, direct, and immediate access to God, the primary priesthood in Christ's

Church is 'the priesthood of all believers'. But within this priesthood there are diversities of functions, constituted by differences in the gifts of the Spirit. Some of these are personal: some are representative of the whole Church. Pre-eminently representative is the ministry of the Word and Sacraments of the Gospel.

In these ministries, as everywhere and in everything that concerns the Church, we lay continual emphasis on the immediate and personal agency and sufficiency of Jesus Christ. He is not merely the Founder of a society, or the Source of a succession, or the Institutor of ordinances; but it is He Himself who always brings pardon and newness of life and growth and perfecting to His people, and who still is to His Church her living Lord and present Head.

The foregoing sentences express, in few words, the general character of what we believe to be the Gospel of the New Testament and its bearing on the idea of the Church and her ministry. These positions are not remote from the practical issues raised by the proposals in the Lambeth scheme. They are principles by which, for us, these issues must be determined. It is in the light of these evangelical principles regarding the Gospel and the Church that we pass to consider certain of the questions thus presented to us.

V

We have already clearly said that the present statement is not a reply to the Lambeth proposals. That must be made by the churches to which they are addressed. Therefore we desire to refrain here from direct criticism. Our duty is not to controvert, but rather to elucidate. It is with this limited and non-controversial purpose that we now touch on what seem to us to be the three important elements in the Lambeth scheme which need to be examined with

care in view of the general conceptions we have briefly indicated. The matters we shall look at are these :

(1) THE RECOGNITION OF CHURCHES.

(2) EPISCOPAL ORDINATION, as proposed in the scheme.

(3) THE SPIRITUAL FREEDOM OF THE CHURCH.

Other points might easily be suggested ; but, for our present purpose, it will be sufficient if we refer to each of these three.

I. RECOGNITION OF CHURCHES

The evangelical conception of the Church of Christ, involving the position that the essential of the Church (or of any branch thereof) is in its relation to the Gospel and not in anything of outward organization, raises a question which concerns the relation of Anglicanism to ourselves and also our relation to others.

About the recognition or non-recognition on the part of Anglicanism of the churches we represent as, in their corporate character, parts of the one Church of the Lord Jesus Christ, we have little to say merely on our own account. It is to their Master that churches, as individuals, stand or fall. We shall only remark that, in our unanimous opinion, without the cordial and practical recognition of one another's church standing, proposals for union cannot be carried out and, indeed, can hardly with propriety be suggested.

But it is in respect of our relations with others that this question has for us a vital interest. Our members are, it must be remembered, in a wider and larger Church fellowship than Anglicanism is. The true sign of Church fellowship is the communion of the Holy Table. A Congregationalist, for example, is in this fellowship not only with Congregationalists, but also (because there exists mutual

recognition) with Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, and others. An Anglican, for reasons we do not here discuss, is not countenanced in seeking this wider fellowship; and his fellow communicants are limited to fellow Anglicans. The result is that when a Congregationalist passes from his communion to Anglicanism, he passes into a smaller Church fellowship, if he were held to cut himself off from his former company of fellow communicants.

This raises for us an issue which is a most practical one. Even on a sanguine view, it is hardly to be supposed that all, or the greater part, of non-episcopal Christendom—in, for example, Scotland or America—will enter at once within the Lambeth scheme of episcopacy. If we, in England, should accept it, would this mean we should no longer be in fullest sacramental communion with any of those whom we now welcome to our pulpits and with whom we join in the celebration of the Lord's Supper? If we should not continue to be in such fellowship with them, we should be committing schism—and a treacherous kind of schism—in the very act of union. If we should continue to be in such full communion, that would mean 'recognition'.

What our churches will desire, therefore, to know is this—whether Anglicanism is prepared to recognize non-episcopal communions (or any of them) as corporate parts of the Church of Christ, and their ministries as ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments. As we read the Lambeth Appeal, it logically implies—particularly by its recognition of our ministries as 'effective ministries of grace', and its use of the words 'all ministries of grace, theirs and ours'—that our communions, like episcopal communions, are already parts of the visible Church of Christ. But, if this be the correct interpretation of the Appeal, it should be made clear that it is so.

Essentially and ultimately, the question is one of what the Living Lord, through His Spirit, says of the churches. We,

for our part, must recognize churches and ministries which manifestly He recognizes : and recognize them not merely in a general way as blessed of Him, but as churches and as ministries of the Word and Sacraments of the Gospel if He does so. We find it quite compatible with this to adhere firmly to what we may believe to be true and scriptural polity, and to decline to treat with indifference what may seem to us to be erroneous or defective in other systems. But the mind of Christ, expressed through the action of His Spirit, must be the Church's guiding rule in this question of recognition as in any other. For this reason, we must not be asked to take any step which would prevent or hamper our continued recognition of sister-churches with which we are at present in sacramental fellowship. We desire to say no word which would make agreement here difficult. But we are certain that the churches which we represent will require a perfectly clear understanding on this most practical issue of recognition—alike of ourselves on the part of Anglicanism, and of others by a re-united Church—and we trust that the answer may be made unmistakable by being given in word and in act.

2. EPISCOPAL ORDINATION

A second issue, which is raised for us in the Lambeth scheme, concerns episcopacy, especially in connexion with ordination.

Of episcopacy as a form of ecclesiastical polity we need say only a word. We have indicated that our view of the Gospel and of the Church keeps us from regarding any one form of polity as essential in the Church Catholic or in any true part of it. We hold—as leading Anglican scholars also hold—that no one form of polity for the Church has been prescribed by the Lord. For this very reason we are the more free to consider what form may be shown to us by the leading of the Spirit as expedient for a reunited Church,

and we, therefore, have an open mind towards episcopal order as towards any other. To this, however, we must add that we cannot be expected to consider any form of polity which claims to be an exclusive channel of grace or which fails to recognize the place and the rights of the Christian people in the affairs of the Church.

These are points, however, into which we need not at present enter further. The question which calls for special examination arises over the proposal of 'episcopal ordination'.

We venture to draw attention to one point. The proposal to make episcopal ordination of ministers who have not received it a part of a scheme of union is in direct opposition to the considered decision of the resolutions of the Mansfield Conference of 1920.¹ That Conference definitely put aside the suggestion of episcopal ordination (which was made to it by an episcopal member), and substituted the declaration that any mutual authorization was to be 'not re-ordination'. We, of course, attach no undue authority to this declaration, but it was signed by a number of representative Free Churchmen (as well as by many Anglicans), and there can be little question that it represents the practically unanimous Free Church view. We feel, therefore, that the obligation rests on those who set episcopal ordination—particularly in its Anglican form, which is not accepted by the majority of Episcopalians—in the forefront of a scheme of union, to bring forward exceptionally cogent grounds for doing so, if they are to win the support of the Free Churches.

In the Lambeth scheme episcopal ordination is introduced as an element in a scheme of mutual ministerial recognition. Its significance and purport in this connexion are not quite clear to us. When it is proposed that episcopalian clergy should be authorized to officiate in Free Churches through

¹ See *Documents bearing on the Problem of Christian Unity and Fellowship 1916-1920* (S.P.C.K.), pp. 83, 84.

' a form of commission or recognition ' which would ' commend ' their ministry to these congregations, and that Free Church ministers should be authorized to officiate in Anglican congregations by ' a commission through episcopal ordination ', what is meant by this last crucial phrase? Is it meant that our ministers should be made ' ministers in the Church of God ', as the Ordinal of the Book of Common Prayer phrases it? Or is it meant that, being already ' ministers in the Church of God ', they are to be formally admitted and authorized to minister within the Church of England? If the former be the meaning, we obviously are thrown back again on the question of recognition. We should not be asked to accept any form which carries, or which could be construed to carry, this interpretation. If, on the other hand, the latter meaning be what is proposed, then certainly ordination is not the requisite or appropriate ceremony or word. Ordination to minister Christ's Word and Sacraments is a general thing, to be given once for all; licence to exercise it in any district or communion is a particular thing which may, of course, be extended. But the two things are different in idea. We are of opinion that the ambiguity here should be cleared up. It is possible, indeed, that we may be told that it is better not to press for its being cleared up, and that the meaning may be left to various, even contrary constructions. This does not commend itself to us either intellectually or ethically. To begin to build a union in the Church of Christ on a conscious ambiguity is not, it seems to us, to build in God's name and in God's way. Whether the Free Churches may find themselves able to accept this proposal of ' commission through episcopal ordination ' or not, they can hardly be expected to accept it—and they certainly should not accept it—without knowing quite clearly what it means.

We do not think it necessary or expedient to pursue these issues further. We shall add that the whole question about

episcopacy, especially about the indispensableness of episcopal ordination, will never be settled by either side appealing merely to its ecclesiastical tradition. Nor, we must remark, can it be approached (as the Lambeth Appeal at this point suggests) merely by 'the way of mutual deference to one another's consciences'. This may be the right and Christian course in many secondary matters; but it cannot be made a guiding principle for large issues in Christ's Church. If it had been so regarded at the Council of Jerusalem, then St. Paul should have deferred to the doubtless often conscientious demands of the Judaizers. Our appeal must be to the Lord of all our consciences, and to His Spirit whose mind is to be discerned from what He does. We declare our readiness alike to learn and—what is more difficult—to unlearn, according to what He manifests to be His will as His Spirit works among the churches.

3. SPIRITUAL FREEDOM

The third matter which seems to require mention as arising out of our principles concerning the Gospel and the Church is the Spiritual Freedom of the Church of Christ.

In general terms, what we mean by the Spiritual Freedom of the Church is this. It is to the corporate life of the Christian Church what freedom of conscience is to the Christian man. The Christian man claims liberty of conscience in matters of religious faith and moral duty that he may learn of and obey his Lord. In the same way, the Church must be free in matters of religious faith and moral duty to learn of and to obey the Lord, who is still living and present in her midst. This is the meaning of the Spiritual Freedom of the Church; and it arises directly out of the principles regarding the Gospel and the Church which we have, in the previous section, laid down.

The Lambeth scheme suggests questions which concern

this freedom in two main respects. One is the matter of the relation of the Church to the Creeds; the other is the relation of the Church to the State.

With regard to the former, we believe that there need be little difficulty. We recognize that the reunited Church will require some common declaration of faith, not to be used as a test, but to be a testimony and witness to the Lord and the Gospel. Here we fully realize the value of the ancient creeds. The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches has, in its published *Declaratory Statement of Common Faith and Practice*, said that these Churches 'claim and cherish their place as inheritors, along with others, of the historic faith of Christendom, which found expression in the oecumenical creeds of the early and undivided church'. We are convinced, therefore, that Free Churchmen generally would be able to give as 'whole-hearted' an acceptance to the Christian faith underlying these creeds as do their Anglican brethren; while, as to the Nicene Creed in particular, such Free Churchmen as are acquainted with the history of doctrinal development in the fourth century can recognize in it 'a sufficient statement of the Christian faith' expressed in the terms of the thought of that age. While, however, recognizing all this, we are concerned also to maintain that truth is ever learning new language, so that terms and modes of thought grow old, and, when they have grown old, easily misinterpret and mislead. While reverencing the traditions of the past, we must keep our minds free to learn of the Holy Spirit, who continues to guide the Church in truth as in duty and who, we believe, has yet more light to break forth from His Word.

As regards the bearing of the question of Spiritual Freedom on the relations between the Church and the State, all that it is necessary to say here is that the Lambeth proposals for reunion no less than our principles concerning

the Gospel and the Church imply great changes in these relations in England. These need not be discussed at this stage. It is enough if we say that Free Churchmen cannot be asked to consent that the civil power—which, within its own sphere, is called to be the servant of God—has any authority over the spiritual affairs of the Church; or, further, to accept any position which would involve injustice or violate the rights of conscience.

We close what we say on the subject of freedom with a word of agreement. We heartily welcome the intention, evident in the Lambeth proposals, that ample liberty should be preserved with regard to forms of worship and much else which is distinctive of different 'groups'. (This liberty would extend to the practice of some amongst us as regards the subjects of Baptism.) We believe that in a reunited Church such liberty would vindicate itself, and that the forms of worship and service eventually surviving would be those approved by the Spirit of our Lord Jesus Christ as most suited to the fullest life of His Body, the Church.

In thus calling attention to the above issues as, in our judgement, important for any candid and adequate consideration of the Lambeth proposals, we must again state that we are addressing our own people, not entering into controversy with others. Further, even where our remarks are negative in form—as necessarily they must be in part, if the scheme is to be tested by what we hold as the New Testament view of the Gospel and the Church—still, we hope that our positive motive is not only present but apparent. The spirit should be more than the letter; and the spirit of the Lambeth Appeal is such a new thing in the relations of conformist to non-conformist Christianity in our land that we must not lose sight of it even in the necessary scrutiny of details. If the right spirit prevails among us all, it may lead us through difficulties which at present seem impassable and may bring into view new

proposals not yet upon the horizon. It is with this aim, and certainly with no intention of closing any doors, that we have made the comments which we have felt it our duty to make on certain points which we think the Free Churches must, in faithfulness to their principles, carefully consider, and, if we have spoken of these with frankness, may we add that we would be the first to recognize that there are also points which our Anglican brethren must, in faithfulness to their principles, consider not less carefully, and we hope they will state these not less frankly? But having said all this, we shall now end our statement on a more positive note, and say what we can to help towards the great ends we all have at heart.

VI

The Lambeth Appeal has set before us a 'vision'. It is that of 'a Church genuinely Catholic, loyal to all truth, and gathering into its fellowship all who profess and call themselves Christians, within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage of the past to the present, shall be possessed in common and made serviceable to the whole Body of Christ'. In this great and lofty conception, we share with profound sympathy; and we recognize in the appeal to seek its realization the accents of our Lord's voice which we cannot disregard. In saying this, we, of course, are not to be held as committing ourselves to any particular form of corporate union. But that all who name the Name of Christ should be united—and that visibly—is a Christian ideal, which we would pursue with all who will seek with us to learn and carry out His will regarding it.

This so great end cannot be attained except under the guidance of God's Holy Spirit. Along what lines the Spirit may ultimately lead the churches, we cannot determine, and at present do not presume even to anticipate. But such steps as are clear and immediate we are called on to take at

once. Our vision implies it, for an ideal ceases to be an ideal if nothing can be done towards its realization. The hope of the future involves the duty of the present. In these first steps, even though they may seem small, we must be guided, not by our own ecclesiastical predilections, but by what the Holy Spirit seems to indicate and countenance. We must refer everything about union—even the simplest steps—seriously and earnestly to Him. We therefore ask ourselves this question—What are the things which the Lord is making clear to us as our present duty in the relationship between the churches, and in doing which we should be following what, through the action of the Spirit, He Himself seems to do? May we answer this question out of our own experience and the experience of the churches to which we belong?

First, we have been finding more and more—largely through the 'interchange of pulpits'—how the various communions of the Evangelical Free Churches are at one with each other in the *Gospel* of our common Lord and Saviour. Secondly, from the consciousness of the possession of the same Gospel, we have been led naturally and inevitably to 'inter-communion'—to that supreme expression and seal of the Gospel in the *Sacrament* which manifests the unity of Christians with one another as well as their oneness with Him. And, thirdly, from this Christian fellowship in Word and in Sacrament, we have been led and are continually being led farther into unity of *service*, and even towards corporate unity. The Kingdom of God at home and, still more, in foreign mission fields has known new life and power as the outcome of the measure of Christian fellowship to which we have attained by these simple and obvious steps in which God has guided us. Union itself has, in many places, assumed a practicability and even urgency which, in earlier times and before these steps were taken, seemed impossible.

We ask—Is it not possible that God would have a wider measure of such intercourse in the Word and Sacrament of the Gospel and in the work of the Gospel in order to open the way to further unity and even to union, and to the more effectual service of His Kingdom? May He not be calling us to stand together in these things at once, that we may learn together in the fellowship of His Spirit thus created, what may be His will as to questions regarding the character and constitution of a reunited Church? Our observation is that the manifest action of His Spirit sanctions these steps, and our experience is that His blessing accompanies them. We believe that if to the readiness for evangelical and sacramental fellowship which the Free Churches have shown were added the sense of the value of visible unity which the Lambeth Appeal has so impressively presented, that would be a combination the possibilities of which for the cause of reunion, under God's blessing, are incalculable. Is this combination not attainable in England to-day?

We, therefore, on our part desire to set before ourselves anew the vision of the one visible Church Catholic of Christ; and if we have not always been moved by this in the past—to account for which, many historical reasons might be given—all the more would we now think, labour, and pray for its realization. We ask our Anglican brethren, on their part, to welcome and to promote closer spiritual fellowship among the churches, especially through the pulpit, at the Communion Table, and in the work of the Kingdom. These may seem small things in face of the problem of reunion. They are not small if the Spirit of the Lord go with us in doing them; and that the Holy Spirit by His presence sanctions intercommunion, and, indeed, precedes us in every step we take towards it, seems to us—and we think must seem to any one looking impartially at the facts of Christendom—far more manifest than that He makes any particular form of order or polity essential in the Church.

So we conclude that the immediate duty of the churches, in this high and sacred matter of reunion, is to unite in the fellowship of the Word and Sacrament of Christ's Gospel and in the work of the Gospel at home and abroad ; and we believe that His Spirit, who goes before us in these things, will go before us to yet greater things, and will lead us in the light of the Gospel, if thus together we proclaim and serve it, to learn the mind of Christ concerning His Church, which is one in Him.

We pray that the Holy Spirit may guide the churches in their decisions, and that grace may be with our brethren of every name in Christ Jesus.

42. *Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England*

RESOLUTIONS OF THE ANNUAL ASSEMBLY, SEPTEMBER 1921

The Federal Council recognizes that in any further conference on the subject the questions raised in the report¹ must be given a primary place with a view, in the language of the Archbishop, to clearing up certain expressions which may be felt to have an ambiguous character. But it desires to express its conviction that this question has now reached a stage when more than ever it is imperative that words of unity should be accompanied by acts of unity. It believes that the discussion would be materially aided if meantime acts of intercommunion and interchange of pulpits and other forms of concerted spiritual action were arranged between the Church of England and the Free Churches. The witness borne in the report to the effect that it is by such means that Church unity has been built up amongst the English Free Churches, has been confirmed by an identical witness from Scotland² where an important Church Union seems about to be consummated.

¹ i. e. No. 41 *supra*.

² See No. 48 *infra*.

The Federal Council, having noted the suggestion of the Bishops that a central conference should be held between representatives of Episcopal and non-Episcopal communions upon the whole subject of the Appeal, and further desiring explication of expressions in the Appeal which are felt to have an ambiguous character, hereby appoints the following with a view to such conference with the two Archbishops and with other members of the Church of England whom they may appoint :

¹Rev. J. D. Jones, M.A., D.D. (Moderator).

²Rev. Charles Brown, D.D.

³Rev. W. T. Davison, M.A., D.D.

⁴Sir Walter Essex.

²Rev. W. Y. Fullerton.

¹Rev. A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D.

⁵Rev. R. C. Gillie, M.A.

²Sir Alfred Pearce Gould, K.C.V.O., M.S.

¹Rev. A. J. Viner.

⁶Rev. S. Horton.

³Rev. H. Maldwyn Hughes, B.A., B.D.

³Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, M.A., D.D.

⁷Right Rev. Bishop Mumford.

⁴Rev. T. Nightingale.

⁶Prof. A. S. Peake, M.A., D.D.

⁵Rev. Alex. Ramsay, D.D.

³Rt. Hon. Walter Runciman.

¹Rev. W. B. Selbie, M.A., D.D.

³Rev. J. Alfred Sharp.

⁵Rev. P. Carnegie Simpson, M.A., D.D.

¹Right Hon. J. H. Whitley, M.P.

⁴Rev. Henry Smith.

⁵Rev. W. Lewis Robertson, M.A., ³Rev. Walter H. Armstrong, and ²Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, M.A., D.D., Secretaries.

¹ Congregational. ² Baptist. ³ Wesleyan. ⁴ United Methodist.

⁵ Presbyterian. ⁶ Primitive Methodist. ⁷ Moravian.

43. *National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England*

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT ITS ASSEMBLY AT LIVERPOOL
MARCH 6-9, 1922

This National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches, in presenting its heartiest thanks to the Bishop of Manchester for his presence and for his most helpful address, desires to express its thankfulness to God for the increase of goodwill between the Churches, and in particular trusts that the discussions in regard to the Lambeth Appeal that are now taking place, may clear up existing differences, secure the common recognition of all vital truths, and so may pave the way for the complete reunion of the separate parts of the Christian Church.

44. *Church Unity*

BEING THE REPORT OF A JOINT CONFERENCE HELD AT LAMBETH PALACE, TOGETHER WITH A PRELIMINARY STATEMENT BY THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY AND YORK AND THE MODERATOR OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCHES, MAY 1922

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

The time has, in our opinion, come when it is desirable that information should be made public as to the present outcome in this country of the 'Appeal to All Christian People', which was issued nearly two years ago by the Bishops attending the Lambeth Conference of 1920.

The Appeal was transmitted by the Archbishop of Canterbury in August 1920 to the different Christian Churches at home and abroad. On September 28, 1920, a provisional statement in reply was issued by the Federal

Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England at their annual meeting, and was endorsed by the National Free Church Council. In April 1921, a fuller statement from the same source was published under the title, 'The Free Churches and the Lambeth Appeal,' and in September 1921, as the result of detailed examination and discussion, the following resolution was passed :

'The Federal Council, having noted the suggestion of the Bishops that a central conference should be held between representatives of Episcopal and non-Episcopal communions upon the whole subject of the Appeal, and further desiring explication of expressions in the Appeal which are felt to have an ambiguous character, hereby appoints the following with a view to such conference with the two Archbishops and with other members of the Church of England whom they may appoint : *Rev. J. D. Jones, M.A., D.D. (Moderator) ; Rev. Charles Brown, D.D. ; Rev. W. T. Davison, M.A., D.D. ; Sir Walter Essex ; Rev. W. Y. Fullerton ; *Rev. A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D. ; Rev. R. C. Gillie, M.A. ; Sir Alfred Pearce Gould, K.C.V.O., M.S. ; Rev. A. J. Viner ; Rev. S. Horton ; Rev. H. Maldwyn Hughes, B.A., B.D. ; *Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, M.A., D.D. ; Right Rev. Bishop Mumford ; Rev. T. Nightingale ; *Professor A. S. Peake, M.A., D.D. ; Rev. Alex. Ramsay, D.D. ; Right Hon. Walter Runciman ; Rev. W. B. Selbie, M.A., D.D. ; Rev. J. Alfred Sharp ; *Rev. P. Carnegie Simpson, M.A., D.D. ; Right Hon. J. H. Whitley, M.P. ; Rev. Henry Smith ; Rev. W. Lewis Robertson, M.A., Rev. Walter H. Armstrong, and *Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, M.A., D.D., secretaries.'

With a view to the desired Conferences, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York nominated as representatives of the Church of England the Archbishop of Canterbury, *the Archbishop of York, the Bishops of London, Winchester, *Gloucester, Ely, Lichfield, *Peterborough, Chelmsford,

Hereford, and *Ripon. *The Bishop of Salisbury was subsequently added, together with *Dr. Headlam, Regius Professor of Divinity of Oxford, and *Dr. Walter Frere.

On November 30, 1921, the Conference met at Lambeth Palace under the chairmanship of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and after prolonged discussion appointed a committee of thirteen persons (six Church of England and six Free Churchmen) to consider, under the chairmanship of the Archbishop of York, some of the issues involving large questions of principle which had been raised during the Conference. The names of those who formed the committee are marked with an asterisk in the foregoing lists. This committee held prolonged meetings in Lambeth Palace in January, March, and April 1922, giving consideration chiefly to the three following subjects: (1) The nature of the Church; (2) The nature of the Ministry; (3) The place of Creeds in a United Church. The committee ultimately decided to present their report in the form of a series of propositions to which they had unanimously agreed. The Conference met at Lambeth Palace on May 24, 1922, to receive the report. The report was considered, and after full discussion the Conference unanimously gave its general approval to the several propositions in the form printed below.

The report must be submitted to the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches, at whose request the Conference was arranged. But the members of the Conference who represent that Council concurred with the representatives of the Church of England in deciding that, without prejudice to any decision of the Council, the report should at once be made public for the information of the Churches represented in the Conference and of all Christian people. It will be understood that the propositions which the report contains are not intended as a complete statement of the great subjects with which they deal; nor even as expressing

what individual members of the Conference or the Churches which they represent might regard as a full statement of their own positions. They are submitted simply as expressing substantially the very large measure of agreement which, after full and frank discussion, the Conference had been enabled to reach.

It is obvious that many matters of great importance are not dealt with in this interim report. These must be the subject of future discussion. But the members of the Conference hope that the agreement which they have so far reached may prove to be a basis upon which, by God's help, further agreement leading to practical action may be built. Meanwhile, we would earnestly press upon all who have this great matter at heart that they should remember steadily, both in public and private prayer, the possibilities which, as we believe, God is opening to our view, in firm assurance that He will, in His own good time, show us the manner of their accomplishment.

RANDALL CANTUAR:

COSMO EBOR:

J. D. JONES, *Moderator of the*

May 29, 1922.

Federal Council.

THE REPORT AS ACCEPTED BY THE CONFERENCE

I. ON THE NATURE OF THE CHURCH

1. The foundation of the Church rests not upon the will or consent or beliefs of men, whether as individuals or as societies, but upon the creative Will of God.

2. The Church is the Body of Christ, and its constitutive principle is Christ Himself, living in His members through His Spirit.

3. As there is but one Christ, and one Life in Him, so there is and can be but one Church.

4. This one Church consists of all those who have been, or are being, redeemed by and in Christ, whether in this world or in the world beyond our sight, but it has its expression in this world in a visible form. Yet the Church, as invisible and as visible, is, by virtue of its one life in Christ, one.

5. This visible Church was instituted by Christ as a fellowship of men united with Him, and in Him with one another, to be His witness and His instrument in the spread of His Kingdom on earth.

6. As a visible Church it must possess certain visible and recognizable marks whereby it can be seen and known by men. These have been since the days of the Apostles at least the following : (a) The profession of faith in God as revealed and incarnate in Christ ; (b) the observance of the two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself ; (c) an ideal of the Christian life protected by a common discipline ; (d) a ministry, representative of the Church, for the preaching of the Word, the administration of the Sacraments, and the maintenance of the unity and continuity of the Church's witness and work. (See II, 1.)

7. Baptism is by the ordinance of Christ and of His Apostles the outward and visible sign of admission into membership of the Church.

8. The Church visible on earth ought to express and manifest to the world by its own visible unity the one Life in Christ of the one Body.

9. The true relation of the Church and local Churches is that which is described in the New Testament—namely, that the Churches are the local representatives of the One Church. The actual situation brought about in the course of history in which there are different and even rival denominational Churches independent of each other and existing together in the same locality, whatever justification arising out of historical circumstances may be claimed for

these temporary separations, cannot be regarded as in accordance with the Purpose of Christ, and every endeavour ought to be made to restore the true position as set forth in the New Testament.

10. The marks which ought to characterize the Church visible on earth are possessed by these existing separate Churches and societies of Christian people in very varying degrees of completeness or defect. Hence, even though they be parts of the visible Church, they cannot be considered as all alike giving equally adequate expression to the Lord's Mind and Purpose. Some, indeed, may be so defective that they cannot rightly be judged to be parts of that Church. But such judgements, though made in trust that they are in accordance with the Divine Mind, must be regarded as limited to the sphere of the visible Church as an ordered society here on earth. It would be presumption to claim that they have a like validity in the sphere of the whole Church as the One Body of the redeemed in Christ, for within that sphere judgement can only be given by the All-knowing Mind and Sovereign Mercy of God.

II. THE MINISTRY

1. A ministry of the Word and Sacrament is a Divine ordinance for the Church, and has been since the days of the Apostles an integral part of its organized life.

2. It is a ministry within the Church exercising representatively, in the Name and by the authority of the Lord Who is the Head of the Church, the powers and functions which are inherent in the Church.

3. It is a ministry of the Church, and not merely of any part thereof.

4. No man can take this ministry upon himself. It must be conferred by the Church, acting through those who have authority given to them in the Church to confer it. There

must be not only an inward call of the Spirit, but also an outward and visible call and commission by the Church.

5. It is in accordance with Apostolic practice and the ancient custom of the Church that this commission should be given through Ordination, with prayer and the laying on of hands by those who have authority given to them to ordain.

6. We believe that in Ordination, together with this commission to minister, Divine Grace is given through the Holy Spirit in response to prayer and faith for the fulfilment of the charge so committed.

7. Within the many Christian Communion into which in the course of history Christendom has been divided, various forms of ministry have grown up according to the circumstances of these several Communion and their beliefs as to the Mind of Christ and the guidance of the New Testament. These various ministries of Word and Sacrament have been, in God's providence, manifestly and abundantly used by the Holy Spirit in His work of 'enlightening the world, converting sinners, and perfecting saints'. But the differences which have arisen with regard to the authority and functions of these various forms of ministry have been and are the occasion of manifold doubts, questions, and misunderstandings. For the allaying of doubts and scruples in the future, and for the more perfect realization of the truth that the ministry is a ministry of the Church, and not merely of any part thereof, means should be provided for the United Church which we desire, whereby its ministry may be acknowledged by every part thereof as possessing the authority of the whole body.

8. In view of the fact that the Episcopate was from early times and for many centuries accepted, and by the greater part of Christendom is still accepted, as the means whereby this authority of the whole body is given, we agree that it ought to be accepted as such for the United Church of the future.

9. Similarly, in view of the place which the Council of Presbyters and the Congregation of the faithful had in the constitution of the early Church, and the preservation of these elements of presbyteral and congregational order in large sections of Christendom, we agree that they should be maintained with a representative and constitutional Episcopate as permanent elements in the order and life of the United Church.

10. The acceptance of Episcopal Ordination for the future would not imply the acceptance of any particular theory as to its origin or character, or the disowning of past ministries of Word and Sacrament otherwise received, which have, together with those received by Episcopal Ordination, been used and blessed by the Spirit of God.

III. THE PLACE OF THE CREED IN A UNITED CHURCH

1. In a united Church there must be unity of Faith, which implies both the subjective element of personal adhesion and an objective standard of truth.

2. The supreme standard of truth is the revelation of God contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as summed up in Jesus Christ.

3. As the Church in its corporate capacity confesses Christ before men, there should be in the United Church a formal statement of its corporate faith in Christ as an expression of what is intellectually implied by its confession of Him.

4. The Creed commonly called Nicene should be accepted by the United Church as the sufficient statement of this corporate faith. The manner and occasions in which the Creed is to be used should be determined by the United Church.

5. With regard to a confession of faith at Baptism, the United Church would be justified in using the Creed which has been for centuries the Baptismal Creed of the Western Church, commonly called the Apostles' Creed. Its use at

Baptism would imply recognition of the corporate faith of the Church therein expressed as the guide and inspiration of the Christian life.

6. The use of the Creeds liturgically in the public worship of the Church should be regarded as an expression of corporate faith and allegiance; and the United Church should be prepared to recognize diversities of use in this as in other liturgical customs.

7. When assent to the Creeds is required by the United Church, such assent should not be understood to imply the acceptance of them as a complete expression of the Christian Faith, or as excluding reasonable liberty of interpretation. It should be understood to imply the acceptance of them as agreeable to the Word of God contained in the Holy Scriptures, as affirming essential elements in the Christian Faith, and as preserving that Faith in the form in which it has been handed down through many centuries in the history of the Christian Church.

8. While we thus recognize the rightful place of the Creeds in the United Church, we also recognize most fully and thankfully the continued Presence and Teaching of the Living Spirit in His Body, and emphasize the duty of the Church to keep its mind free and ready to receive from Him in each day and generation ever-renewed guidance in the apprehension and expression of the truth.

45. The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE ANNUAL ASSEMBLY
SEPTEMBER 1922

I. The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England receives the Report concerning Unity, which embodies the provisional statement adopted by the Joint Conference of representatives of the Church of England

and the Evangelical Free Churches meeting at Lambeth, and it records its thanks to its members who have taken part in these deliberations.

II. The Council, in receiving the Report of the Conference would point out that it was not charged by its constituent denominations with the preparation of a scheme of reunion, but simply to inquire into the conditions antecedent thereto; and further, it must be understood that this is an Interim Report, of a preliminary and introductory character. The formal pronouncement on any scheme of union or proposals thereon would at the proper time fall to the authoritative assemblies or courts of the various Churches concerned and would properly arise on an official approach by the Church of England itself. The Council, however, desires to place on record the following findings regarding its main propositions.

(a) We welcome the statements which declare the essentially spiritual character of the Church of Christ, as having its 'constitutive principle' in 'Christ Himself, living in His members through His Spirit', and as comprehending 'all those who have been or are being redeemed by and in Christ'. We regard this as meaning that no true believers in the Lord Jesus Christ, faith in whom is the one indispensable condition of salvation, are to be held as being outside the Church, whatever institutional rites or forms for the orderly expression of membership it may be right to maintain in the visible Church.

(b) We appreciate the association for the first time, in a document of the character of the Joint Report, of presbyteral and congregational order along with episcopal. We are of the opinion that the combination of all these elements is the only possible basis of polity for a reunited Church.

(c) We heartily approve of the place assigned to the revelation of God given in the Bible and 'summed up in Jesus Christ' as the 'Supreme Standard of Truth', and also of the 'full and thankful' recognition of 'the continued Presence and Teaching of the Living Spirit' in the Church, which is to receive from Him 'ever renewed guidance in the apprehension and expression of the truth'. We regard the place given to the two ancient catholic creeds as thus subordinate to the inspired Word and living Spirit; and these creeds are received not as a complete expression of the faith, but as preserving 'essential elements' in it 'in the form handed down through many centuries', and with reasonable liberty as to their interpretation and their use. We hold as not only consistent with this, but as implied in it, alike the fullest freedom in the intellectual investigation of Truth and the most single-hearted discipleship to the Mind of Christ.

III. The Council is well aware that there are practical difficulties which yet remain to be considered, and, in particular,

1. What is meant by a 'representative and constitutional' episcopate, and how the elements of presbyteral and congregational order may be combined with it;
2. The Status of the existing Free Church ministry;
3. The relation of the Free Churches to Communions with which they are in fellowship in other parts of the world;
4. The problems connected with the union between Church and State;
5. The safe-guarding of the evangelical principles of the Reformation.

The Federal Council, while earnestly continuing to seek the things of charity and unity, is resolved in no way to imperil either the evangel or the freedom which are the heritage of the Churches it represents.

IV. The Council, while greatly valuing conference with brethren of the Anglican Church over such matters of doctrine and polity as those discussed in this Report, thinks it needful to reaffirm declarations already made more than once on two points, viz. :

- (a) That a primary question in any negotiations concerning unity is whether the Churches engaged in them are prepared to recognize one another as Churches—parts, in their corporate capacity, of the one Church of the Lord Jesus Christ ;
- (b) That discussion of union should be increasingly accompanied by acts of unity between these Churches.

The Council rejoices in the growing spirit of fellowship between the Churches, but is of opinion that in the true interests of unity the time has come when a clear understanding on these points should be sought for by those who represent it in these conferences.

V. The Council reappoints the Committee as follows :

Rev. J. D. Jones, M.A., D.D. (Moderator).

Rev. S. M. Berry, M.A.

Rev. Charles Brown, D.D.

Rev. W. T. Davison, M.A., D.D.

Rev. J. C. Carlile, C.B.E., D.D.

Sir Walter Essex.

Rev. W. Y. Fullerton.

Rev. A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D.

Rev. R. C. Gillie, M.A., D.C.L.

Rev. S. Horton.

Rev. H. Maldwyn Hughes, B.A., D.D.

Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, M.A., D.D.
Mr. Herbert Marnham.
Bishop H. R. Mumford.
Rev. T. Nightingale.
Prof. A. S. Peake, M.A., D.D.
Rev. Alexander Ramsay, M.A., D.D.
Rt. Hon. Walter Runciman.
Rev. W. B. Selbie, M.A., D.D.
Rev. J. Alfred Sharp.
Rev. P. Carnegie Simpson, M.A., D.D.
Rev. Henry Smith.
Rt. Hon. J. H. Whitley, M.P.
Rev. F. L. Wiseman, B.A.
Rev. Thomas Yates.
Rev. Walter H. Armstrong.
Rev. W. L. Robertson, M.A.
Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, M.A., D.D.

And it commends the whole matter, so fraught with great issues for the future of religion in our land and throughout the world, to the interest and prayers of all Christian people.

The following Sub-Committee for Special Conferences at Lambeth was appointed :

Rev. J. D. Jones, M.A., D.D.
Rev. Charles Brown, D.D.
Rev. A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D.
Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, M.A., D.D.
Prof. A. S. Peake, M.A., D.D.
Rev. P. Carnegie Simpson, M.A., D.D.
Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, M.A., D.D.

It was agreed to sanction the publication of these Resolutions and their transmission to the Secretaries of the Denominations represented in the Council.

46. *Memorandum on the Status of the Existing
Free Church Ministry*

PRESENTED ON BEHALF OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND
REPRESENTATIVES ON THE JOINT CONFERENCE AT
LAMBETH PALACE, JULY 6, 1923

[The Church of England Representatives on the Joint Conference were the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Bishops of London (Dr. Winnington-Ingram), Winchester (Dr. Talbot), Ely (Dr. Chase), Lichfield (Dr. Kempthorne), Peterborough (Dr. Woods), Chelmsford (Dr. Watts-Ditchfield), Hereford (Dr. Linton-Smith), Ripon (Dr. Strong), Salisbury (Dr. Donaldson), Gloucester (Dr. Headlam), Bishop Gibson, and the Rev. W. H. Frere, D.D.]

The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England at its meeting in September, 1922, received the report of the Joint Conference held at Lambeth Palace, and reappointed its committee and sub-committee to continue the conferences. In so doing, in Paragraph III of its report, the council mentioned certain 'practical difficulties which yet remain to be considered'. Among them was 'the status of the existing Free Church ministry'. Accordingly the sub-committee proceeded to give long and full consideration to this subject, and we who represent the Church of England have been asked to submit a memorandum upon it.

It will be remembered that the main object of the conferences which have been held has been to elucidate the Appeal of the Lambeth Conference to all Christian people. Whatever wishes or opinions we who submit this memorandum may individually have, we consider ourselves bound by that Appeal and not entitled to go beyond its statements, or what in our judgement may be legitimately inferred from them. Further, our memorandum cannot be regarded as an official interpretation of the Appeal. The responsibility for what is contained in it is limited to those who present it.

We are compelled to say at the outset that our difficulty in discussing the status of the Free Church ministry has been to discover accurately what the term includes and implies, whether the phrase represents any accepted unity as to the principles which underlie this ministry, or as to the manner in which it is conferred. We do indeed most thankfully acknowledge that the Free Church members of our committee agreed with us in the statement of principles with regard to the ministry of Christ's Church, which were set forth in our first report (II. 1-6). But the very full, frank, and friendly conferences which we have had together made it plain that in fact within the Free Churches there have been and are very varying traditions and conceptions as to the nature of the ministry, and as to the meaning of Ordination, and very varying customs as to the manner in which Ordination is conferred and ministers are accredited. For example, to mention only one of these differences, although in our first report it was agreed (II. 5) that 'it is in accordance with Apostolic practice and the ancient custom of the Church, that the commission by the Church should be given through Ordination with prayer and laying on of hands by those who have authority given to them to ordain', yet in fact several of the Free Churches have not used in the past and do not always now use the laying on of hands.

During our conferences we have been asked to consider Free Church ministries prospectively—from the point of view of the conceptions and usages in which they are increasingly ready to unite—rather than retrospectively—from the point of view of conceptions and usages which have been prevalent in the past. It is indeed a great satisfaction to think that the principles which we were able to set forth in our first report as agreed upon by us all are becoming more and more fully characteristic of the ministries of the Free Churches represented on our committee.

But our difficulty is that we are specifically asked to write about the Free Church ministry as it exists. We trust that our Free Church brethren in the committee will generously appreciate the difficulty thus frankly expressed, and understand why it is not possible for us to give any single and unconditional answer to the question put before us.

In what follows in this memorandum it will be understood that we have in mind ministries, which in some real measure are given and exercised in accordance with the principles set forth in our first report—ministries which rest upon a long-established order, which have been conferred by some solemn and authoritative act implying Ordination to the ministry of the Universal Church and not merely commission to the ministry of a particular denomination, and which are regarded as involving a life-long vocation.

I

Such Free Church ministries we find it impossible to regard as 'invalid', that is, as null and void, or as effecting none of the purposes for which the ministry has been Divinely ordained in the Church of Christ. Indeed, we wish that the terms 'valid' and 'invalid' could be discontinued, involving as they seem to do a knowledge of the Divine Will and purpose and grace which we do not possess, and which it would be presumption to claim.

But we consider that we are entitled, by manifest tokens of Divine blessing which these ministries possess, and also by the spirit and the terms of the Lambeth Appeal about them, to go further, and to say that we regard them as being within their several spheres real ministries in the Universal Church.

The Bishops, in the Lambeth Appeal, began by saying : ' We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ and have been baptized into the name of the Holy

Trinity as sharing with us membership in the Universal Church of Christ, which is His Body.' And as to the ministries of those communions which do not possess the Episcopate, they say that they do not call in question for a moment the spiritual reality of these ministries, but, on the contrary, they thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace.

It seems to us to be in accordance with the Lambeth Appeal to say, as we are prepared to say, that the ministries which we have in view in this memorandum, ministries which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ's Word and administer the Sacraments as Christ has ordained, and to which authority so to do has been solemnly given by the Church concerned, are real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church.

II

Yet ministries, even when so regarded, may be in varying degrees irregular or defective.

The committee has already agreed in regard to the now separate Churches that, 'even though they be parts of the visible Church, they cannot be considered as all alike giving equally adequate expression to the Lord's mind and purpose.' Such irregularities or defects may belong to the sphere of faith or discipline, and also to the sphere of ministry. There are some who consider our own ministry in one way or another defective or irregular. It is possible that even among the Free Churches themselves there may be ministries exercised by one which are regarded by another as in some respects, more or less important, irregular, or inadequate. In each case such judgements must be regarded as due to our several beliefs as to the mind and purpose of our Lord Himself for His Church and the

continuous guidance of the Holy Spirit within the Church. The existence of these differences with regard to the authority and functions of the ministry, inevitable in the present divided condition of the Church, only increases our longing for a time when, in a united Church, they may be removed.

The belief and practice of the Anglican Church are set forth in the Preface to the Ordinal contained in the Book of Common Prayer, in which it is said 'that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church ; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons ' ; and that ' to the intent that these Orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed, in the Church of *England* ; no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the Church of *England*, or suffered to execute any of the said Functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration, or Ordination '.

Thus, the Anglican Church is bound to secure the authorization of its ministers for its own congregations, and no one could be authorized to exercise his ministry among them who had not been episcopally ordained.

It is not possible in this memorandum to set forth fully the reasons for this position. But it can be said :

1. We regard the rule quoted above as much more than a mere rule of internal discipline. It embodies principles to which the Anglican Church has throughout its history adhered, and which contribute to the special position which it claims to hold in the Christian Church.

2. We cannot lose sight of the relations in which we stand to other Episcopal Churches in East and West ; nor can we ignore the danger of creating pain and disturbance, or even the possibility of schism, within our own communion if the rule and principle contained in the Ordinal were to be set aside.

III

In the last section we have stated our position with the frankness which has been characteristic of our conferences. But we hope that what we have there said will be viewed as regards the present, in conjunction with what we have said in the preceding section as to the character of some at least of the Free Church ministries as real ministries of the Word and Sacrament ; and, as regards the future, in conjunction with what was said in the first report of the committee (II. 8, 9). We have there recognized that these ministries have a value of their own as standing for elements of Presbyterian and Congregational order which should be maintained with the Episcopate as permanent elements in the order and life of the United Church. We desire that in the episcopal ordinations of the future these elements should in some real way be represented so that both our traditions and those of the Free Churches should contribute to the fullness of the future ministry of a United Church.

Moreover, we see in the movements towards union, of which our conferences have been a happy and hopeful sign, that a new situation is being created which calls for new ways in which the ministry of the Free Churches and our own may be brought into closer relations. For when circumstances arise which have no exact precedent a true principle of 'economy' entitles the Church to meet them with new methods. We may quote the words of the Committee on Reunion which submitted the Appeal and its accompanying Resolutions to the Lambeth Conference (Report, page 141) :

When men set their faces steadily towards the ideal of our Appeal and especially when negotiations for organic reunion are in progress, or, again, when a scheme of union has in any place been adopted, situations will arise in which we should all agree that new lines of action may be followed.

Thus (1) As regards the immediate present, here in England, the Convocations of Canterbury and York have endorsed the Resolution of the Lambeth Conference (12. A. [i]). 'A Bishop is justified in giving occasional authorization to ministers not episcopally ordained, who, in his judgement, are working towards an ideal of union such as is described in our Appeal, to preach in churches within his diocese, and to clergy of the diocese to preach in the churches of such ministers.' We earnestly hope that this Resolution will be followed by action in accordance with it. (2) As regards the future, if by God's blessing any of the Free Churches and the Anglican Church were to agree to unite on the basis of the acceptance of Episcopacy for the future, the Lambeth Conference (Resolution 12. A. [iii]) has given its approval to the suggestions that ministers of both the uniting communions should at once be recognized as of equal status in the councils of the United Church, and that the terms of the union should include for the time being the right of non-episcopally ordained ministers to conduct services other than celebrations of the Holy Communion, and to preach in churches which possess an episcopal ministry, if licensed thereto by the Bishop. But the whole subject of the arrangements which should be made for the exercise of ministry by the ministers of one of the uniting Churches in the congregations of the others during the period between the time when the union has been inaugurated and the time when it would be completed by the ministries of all the Churches having one common source and authority, is one which demands further and very careful consideration. We do not think it necessary to discuss this subject in the present memorandum. If our conferences are continued and the subject were to be expressly referred to us, we would be prepared to consider it. It is plain that during this period of transition there would be many inevitable irregularities and difficulties and a constant need of patience,

charity, and mutual considerateness. But there would also be the sustaining and encouraging knowledge that each year would bring the time nearer when union would be sealed by the possession of one ministry throughout the United Church.

IV

Finally, we would urge that it is in the light of this hope for the future rather than from the point of view of the difficulties of the present or of the provisions necessary for a time admittedly transitional that the problem of reunion must be considered. It is towards the fulfilment of this hope that we must direct our thought, our labours, and our prayers.

APPENDED NOTE

PRESENTED ON BEHALF OF THE FREE CHURCH REPRESENTATIVES ON THE JOINT CONFERENCE ¹

The representatives of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England on the sub-committee, having considered the document presented by the Anglican members as their reply to the question of the status of the existing Free Church ministries, desire to express their cordial appreciation of the spirit in which the reply is conceived. While recognizing that the responsibility for this answer must rest with the Anglican members, the representatives of the Federal Council desire to record their opinion that the document contains statements of such importance as amply to justify their hope that the Federal Council will reappoint the committee to unite with the representatives of the Church of England in further discussion of the many points that still remain to be considered.

¹ The names of the Free Church representatives are given on page 142, but Sir A. P. Gould and the Rev. A. J. Viner should be omitted, and the Revs. S. M. Berry, J. C. Carlile, F. L. Wiseman, and T. Yates, and Mr. H. Marnham should be added.

47. *The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches*

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE ANNUAL ASSEMBLY
SEPTEMBER 18, 1923

I

The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England receives the report of its committee, which contains the memorandum on 'The Status of the Existing Free Church Ministry' by the Anglican members of the Joint Conference meeting at Lambeth. The Council concurs with its representatives on the Joint Conference in expressing cordial appreciation of the spirit in which this memorandum is conceived, and it has given to it respectful and careful consideration. Believing that a direct communication of this character from the Anglican representatives calls for, and is entitled to, some definite statement as to the attitude of the Free Churches in respect to it, the Council makes the following comments on its main positions:

I. We cordially welcome the crucial declaration that 'the Ministries which we have in view in this memorandum—Ministries which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ's Word and administer the Sacraments as Christ has ordained, and to which authority so to do has been solemnly given by the Church concerned—are real Ministries of Christ's Word and Sacrament in the Universal Church'. The Lambeth Appeal itself spoke in general terms of these ministries as having 'spiritual reality' and as having been 'blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace'. It is now explicitly said of them (a) that they minister the Gospel of Christ; (b) that they minister also the Sacraments; and (c) that they are within the Universal or Catholic Church. If the recognition thus so unmistakably

given in words were translated into unmistakable actions, a great and difficult problem in reunion would be within sight of practical solution.

2. We note, however, with regret that, in the succeeding section of the memorandum, not only is this recognition not followed by recommendations for appropriate action, but the plan contemplated and required for the exercise of a full ministry within the Anglican Church is precisely that plan which would be followed, and which is followed, in the case of persons possessing no kind of ministry—namely episcopal ordination. This means that what has just been conceded in the most satisfactory language is not to be given effect to in practice. Any question—either on the part of the Anglican Church or of that of the Free Churches—of ‘irregular’ or of what may be regarded as ‘defective’ denominational commission is quite a different matter, to be dealt with in its own proper way; but that way certainly is not ordination to the ministry of Word and Sacrament in the Church of Christ of a man already acknowledged to be in that ministry. All this seems to us manifest and even axiomatic; and we are unable to believe that the position which, at one moment, acknowledges that Free Church ministries are ‘real ministries of Christ’s Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church’, and at the next requires nevertheless that those in them must be ordained to the ministry of that very Word of Christ and those very Sacraments of Christ—that such a position will be found one on which our Anglican brethren with consistency of thinking and acting can permanently stand.

3. We turn to the grounds of this insistence on episcopal ordination and we are referred to the Preface attached to the Ordinal in 1661, which laid it down that ‘no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest or Deacon in the Church of *England*, or suffered to execute

any of the said Functions except he be called, tried, examined and admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration, or Ordination'. We remark that this drastic rule, which applies to 'any of the said Functions', is not strictly obeyed by the Church of England to-day as regards the function of preaching; and the Lambeth Conference of 1920—as the present memorandum reminds us—expressly countenances this exception in certain circumstances. This is but one indication that we are dealing to-day not with the Anglicanism of the Restoration, which deliberately desired to exclude Nonconformists and which penalized them, but with the Anglicanism of the Lambeth Appeal, which earnestly seeks reunion and which approaches Nonconformity with friendship. But we should do injustice to our Anglican brethren who present this memorandum if we suggested that they grounded themselves merely on a clause from a preface inserted at a time more marked by controversy than by charity. They say that this preface 'embodies principles to which the Anglican Church has throughout its history adhered'. We submit that this is hardly accurate historically. It is well known that up to the time of this deliberately exclusive preface, there were ministering in the cures of the Church of England 'many'—it is Bishop Cosin's reckoning—who had not received episcopal ordination, and whom the Bishops did not reordain. We do not magnify these cases, which were, we admit, exceptional. But if the Church of England in the seventeenth century could receive ministers from certain reformed Churches without episcopal ordination and yet did not thereby lose its catholic identity, then it could and can—so far as principle goes—in the twentieth century admit, by some method other than ordination, those whom, despite their not having had episcopal hands laid upon them, it has just formally and fully recognized as being really in

the ministry of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church. It could do it so far as any 'principles to which the Anglican Church has throughout its history adhered' are concerned. We ask no immediate or premature answer. We believe that God's guidance of us all in this matter has not ended, and that the last word on it has not been said on either side. We feel deeply that this age-long and difficult problem can be solved only by some great and worthy act, inspired by courage and vision, in which men and Churches are willing to take their lives in their hands for the sake of the realization of a great ideal.

II

The Federal Council makes the above comments on the memorandum which it has received in an entirely conciliatory spirit towards what it recognizes to be a friendly as well as a sincere statement. In the interests of union the representatives of the Free Churches have endeavoured to meet their Anglican brethren at every point so far as they could do so without sacrifice of vital principle. The question of ordination is the place where we look to the Anglican Church to meet their Free Church brethren. The Council has felt that, after three years of fruitful conference, it could express its mind on this subject, as it has done, with perfect frankness. The movement towards re-union has now passed the stage when it can be dealt with simply by discussion. We have come close to the crucial issues, and must deal with them with clearness, courage, and charity.

III

The Council adds that the recognition of Free Church ministries given in the memorandum which it has considered enforces the contention which the Council has more than once emphasized that the deliberations over union in Conferences and committees should be accom-

panied by practical action. Since Anglican clergy and Free Church ministers are in the one Universal Church, and are ministering the same Word and the same Sacraments, then, surely, there should be more of fellowship and co-operation than there is, even though the final difficulty about ordination be not yet surmounted. The Council feels the Union movement cannot—especially in the minds of the people—live entirely on private conferences and their reports; and it renews its declaration of last year that ‘the discussion of union should be increasingly accompanied by acts of unity between the Churches’. It heartily welcomes the references to this towards the close of the memorandum. And in this connexion it notes with warm appreciation the visits of the two Archbishops and some of the Bishops to the Free Church assemblies, and the presence of a number of Free Church preachers in Cathedral and other Anglican pulpits.

IV

The Council recognizes with deep gratitude the guidance and blessing of God in the course which the conferences have taken and the spirit by which they have been moulded. The way of reunion is not yet clear to any one of us. It is our part to seek a fuller understanding of one another in further conference and common prayer, believing that God’s way will be revealed to us.

The Council reappoints the committee as follows :

- Rev. Walter H. Armstrong.
- Sir Ryland Adkins, K.C.
- Rev. J. T. Barkby.
- Rev. S. M. Berry, M.A.
- Rev. Charles Brown, D.D.
- Rev. W. T. Davison, M.A., D.D.
- Rev. J. C. Carlile, C.B.E., D.D.

Sir Walter Essex.

Rev. W. Y. Fullerton.

Rev. A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D.

Rev. R. C. Gillie, M.A., D.C.L.

Rev. S. Horton.

Rev. J. D. Jones, M.A., D.D.

Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, M.A., D.D.

Sir Henry Lunn, M.D.

Mr. Herbert Marnham.

Bishop H. R. Mumford.

Rev. T. Nightingale.

Prof. A. S. Peake, M.A., D.D.

Rev. Alexander Ramsay, M.A., D.D.

Rev. W. L. Robertson, M.A.

Rt. Hon. Walter Runciman.

Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, M.A., D.D.

Rev. W. B. Selbie, M.A., D.D.

Rev. J. Alfred Sharp.

Rev. P. Carnegie Simpson, M.A., D.D.

Rev. Henry Smith.

Rt. Hon. J. H. Whitley, M.P.

Rev. F. L. Wiseman, B.A.

Rev. Thomas Yates.

It instructs these representatives to confer further on the matters above mentioned, and also on questions still outstanding of those remitted last year. And it again commends the whole issue to the blessing of God, and to the believing prayers and the practical interest of Christian people.

VII. THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND AND THE UNITED FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND

48. *Church of Scotland Act, 1921*

[The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1908 resolved to 'request the other Presbyterian Churches to confer with them on the present ecclesiastical situation . . . with a view to discover in what manner a larger measure of Christian fellowship and co-operation may be secured . . . and the way further prepared for that closer union for which many hearts now eagerly long and pray'. The General Assembly of the United Free Church of Scotland appointed a Committee to consider this invitation; and the next year replied saying that 'while unable to regard co-operation as, in the circumstances, a hopeful way of promoting union they would welcome unrestricted conference on the ecclesiastical situation, and on the main causes which keep the Churches apart; in the earnest hope that, by God's blessing, misunderstandings and hindrances may be removed, and the great object of Presbyterian Re-union in Scotland thereby advanced'. The same year, 1909, the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland declared their readiness to enter into such unrestricted conference, and Committees were appointed accordingly by both Assemblies. These Committees reported in 1911 the result of their conferences, under the heads of 'The Spiritual Freedom of the Church' and 'The National Recognition of Religion', stating what were the main causes which kept the Churches apart, arising out of the existing relation of the Church of Scotland to the State. The Church of Scotland intimated its preparedness to seek the removal of these obstacles to union and drafted Articles in 1914 as a Constitution under which the Church would be both National and Free. The outbreak of war in that year arrested further progress; but in 1919 Conferences were resumed, and a joint statement was prepared by the Committees of the Churches fully explaining what would be the practical result of the acceptance of the Articles. (That Joint Report is printed as an Appendix in the Reports of both Committees to their respective Assemblies in 1919.) The Articles were submitted to

the Presbyteries by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and on December 17, 1920 it was reported to the Commission of the General Assembly with 74 out of 84 Presbyteries approving, while 9 disapproved. The Church of Scotland Committee was then authorized to approach the Government, and the Church of Scotland Bill was introduced into Parliament. In May 1921 the Assembly of the Church of Scotland approved the Bill; the Assembly of the United Free Church also welcoming the Articles 'as setting forth a full and adequate statement of the inherent liberties and powers in matters spiritual which the Church has from Christ as its Divine Head as subject to Him alone'. 'The Assembly recognize that in the line therein indicated the continuity and identity of both Churches would be maintained, and that the United Church would bear the character of a purely spiritual institution, in no sense deriving powers from, or controlled by the State, nor possessing privilege to the prejudice of other Churches, the principles of the Churches being safeguarded, while as regards State-relations the main causes keeping them apart have been found capable of being removed.' The Bill thus introduced was passed without any material change and without a Division in either House and received the Royal Assent in July 1921.

Certain questions, however, still remained before the way was clear for an actual incorporating union of the two Churches, notably in relation to the tenure and enjoyment of the property and endowments of the Church of Scotland. Accordingly in 1922 a Departmental Committee was appointed by the Secretary for Scotland 'to enquire and report upon the existing law as affected by the Church of Scotland Act 1921, and as to what further legislative amendments—particularly in relation to the tenure of the property and endowments of the Church of Scotland—are necessary in view of the coming into force of that Act, in order to facilitate Church Union'. This Committee, presided over by Lord Haldane, reported in 1923, and its recommendations were considered by the two General Assemblies in May 1923. Both Assemblies cordially approved the report and its recommendations, and without committing themselves as regards details desired that legislative effect should be given to the recommendations as soon as possible with a view to the undertaking by the Churches of the negotiations necessary to their entering on an incorporating union. The Church of Scotland (Property and Endowments) Bill was introduced in the House of Lords by the Secretary for Scotland on January 15, 1924.]

[11 & 12
GEO. 5.].*Church of Scotland Act, 1921*

[CH. 29]

A.D. 1921. An Act to declare the lawfulness of certain Articles declaratory of the Constitution of the Church of Scotland in matters spiritual prepared with the authority of the General Assembly of the Church.
[28th July 1921.]

WHEREAS certain articles declaratory of the constitution of the Church of Scotland in matters spiritual have been prepared with the authority of the General Assembly of the Church, with a view to facilitate the union of other Churches with the Church of Scotland, which articles are set out in the Schedule to this Act, and together with any modifications of the said articles or additions thereto made in accordance therewith are hereinafter in this Act referred to as 'the Declaratory Articles':

And whereas it is expedient that any doubts as to the lawfulness of the Declaratory Articles should be removed:

Be it therefore enacted by the King's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:

Effect of
Declaratory
Articles.

1. The Declaratory Articles are lawful articles, and the constitution of the Church of Scotland in matters spiritual is as therein set forth, and no limitation of the liberty, rights and powers in matters spiritual therein set forth shall be derived from any statute or law affecting the Church of Scotland in matters spiritual at present in force, it being hereby declared that in all questions of construction the Declaratory Articles shall prevail, and that all such statutes and laws shall be construed in

conformity therewith and in subordination thereto, and all such statutes and laws in so far as they are inconsistent with the Declaratory Articles are hereby repealed and declared to be of no effect. A.D. 1921.

2. Nothing contained in this Act or in any other Act affecting the Church of Scotland shall prejudice the recognition of any other Church in Scotland as a Christian Church protected by law in the exercise of its spiritual functions. Other Churches not to be prejudiced.

3. Subject to the recognition of the matters dealt with in the Declaratory Articles as matters spiritual, nothing in this Act contained shall affect or prejudice the jurisdiction of the civil courts in relation to any matter of a civil nature. Jurisdiction of civil courts.

4. This Act may be cited as the Church of Scotland Act, 1921, and shall come into operation on such date as His Majesty may fix by Order in Council after the Declaratory Articles shall have been adopted by an Act of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland with the consent of a majority of the Presbyteries of the Church. Citations and commencement.

SCHEDULE

ARTICLES DECLARATORY OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND IN MATTERS SPIRITUAL

I. The Church of Scotland is part of the Holy Catholic or Universal Church ; worshipping one God, Almighty, all-wise, and all-loving, in the Trinity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, the same in substance, equal in power and glory ; adoring the Father, infinite in Majesty, of whom are all things ; confessing our Lord Jesus Christ, the Eternal Son, made very man for our salvation ; glorying in His Cross and Resurrection, and owning obedience to Him as the Head over all things to His Church ; trusting in the promised renewal and guidance of the Holy Spirit ; proclaiming the forgiveness of sins and acceptance with God through faith

A. D. 1921. in Christ, and the gift of Eternal life ; and labouring for the advancement of the Kingdom of God throughout the world. The Church of Scotland adheres to the Scottish Reformation ; receives the Word of God which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as its supreme rule of faith and life ; and avows the fundamental doctrines of the Catholic faith founded thereupon.

II. The principal subordinate standard of the Church of Scotland is the Westminster Confession of Faith approved by the General Assembly of 1647, containing the sum and substance of the Faith of the Reformed Church. Its government is Presbyterian, and is exercised through Kirk-sessions, Presbyteries, Provincial Synods, and General Assemblies. Its system and principles of worship, orders, and discipline are in accordance with 'The Directory for the Public Worship of God', 'The Form of Presbyterial Church Government', and 'The Form of Process', as these have been or may hereafter be interpreted or modified by Acts of the General Assembly or by consuetude.

III. This Church is in historical continuity with the Church of Scotland which was reformed in 1560, whose liberties were ratified in 1592, and for whose security provision was made in the Treaty of Union of 1707. The continuity and identity of the Church of Scotland are not prejudiced by the adoption of these Articles. As a national Church representative of the Christian Faith of the Scottish people it acknowledges its distinctive call and duty to bring the ordinances of religion to the people in every parish of Scotland through a territorial ministry.

IV. This Church, as part of the Universal Church wherein the Lord Jesus Christ has appointed a government in the hands of Church office-bearers, receives from Him, its Divine King and Head, and from Him alone, the right and power subject to no civil authority to legislate, and to adjudicate finally, in all matters of doctrine, worship, government, and discipline in the Church, including the right to determine all questions concerning membership and office in the Church, the constitution and membership of its Courts, and the mode of election of its office-bearers, and to define the

boundaries of the spheres of labour of its ministers and other office-bearers. Recognition by civil authority of the separate and independent government and jurisdiction of this Church in matters spiritual, in whatever manner such recognition be expressed, does not in any way affect the character of this government and jurisdiction as derived from the Divine Head of the Church alone, or give to the civil authority any right of interference with the proceedings or judgements of the Church within the sphere of its spiritual government and jurisdiction.

A.D. 1921.

V. This Church has the inherent right, free from interference by civil authority, but under the safeguards for deliberate action and legislation provided by the Church itself, to frame or adopt its subordinate standards, to declare the sense in which it understands its Confession of Faith, to modify the forms of expression therein, or to formulate other doctrinal statements, and to define the relation thereto of its office-bearers and members, but always in agreement with the Word of God and the fundamental doctrines of the Christian Faith contained in the said Confession, of which agreement the Church shall be sole judge, and with due regard to liberty of opinion in points which do not enter into the substance of the Faith.

VI. This Church acknowledges the divine appointment and authority of the civil magistrate within his own sphere, and maintains its historic testimony to the duty of the nation acting in its corporate capacity to render homage to God, to acknowledge the Lord Jesus Christ to be King over the nations, to obey His laws, to reverence His ordinances, to honour His Church, and to promote in all appropriate ways the Kingdom of God. The Church and the State owe mutual duties to each other, and acting within their respective spheres may signally promote each other's welfare. The Church and the State have the right to determine each for itself all questions concerning the extent and the continuance of their mutual relations in the discharge of these duties and the obligations arising therefrom.

VII. The Church of Scotland, believing it to be the will of Christ that His disciples should be all one in the

A.D. 1921. Father and in Him, that the world may believe that the Father has sent Him, recognizes the obligation to seek and promote union with other Churches in which it finds the Word to be purely preached, the sacraments administered according to Christ's ordinance, and discipline rightly exercised; and it has the right to unite with any such Church without loss of its identity on terms which this Church finds to be consistent with these Articles.

VIII. The Church has the right to interpret these Articles, and, subject to the safeguards for deliberate action and legislation provided by the Church itself, to modify or add to them; but always consistently with the provisions of the first Article hereof, adherence to which, as interpreted by the Church, is essential to its continuity and corporate life. Any proposal for a modification of or addition to these Articles which may be approved of by the General Assembly shall, before it can be enacted by the Assembly, be transmitted by way of overture to Presbyteries in at least two immediately successive years. If the overture shall receive the approval, with or without suggested amendment, of two-thirds of the whole of the Presbyteries of the Church, the Assembly may revise the overture in the light of any suggestions by Presbyteries, and may transmit the overture when so revised to Presbyteries for their consent. If the overture as transmitted in its final form shall receive the consent of not less than two-thirds of the whole of the Presbyteries of the Church, the General Assembly may, if it deems it expedient, modify or add to these Articles in terms of the said overture. But if the overture as transmitted in its final form shall not receive the requisite consent, the same or a similar proposal shall not be again transmitted for the consent of Presbyteries until an interval of five years after the failure to obtain the requisite consent has been reported to the General Assembly.

IX. Subject to the provisions of the foregoing Articles and the powers of amendment therein contained, the Constitution of the Church of Scotland in matters spiritual is hereby anew ratified and confirmed by the Church.

49. *The Church of Scotland*

RESOLUTION ON THE LAMBETH APPEAL ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, MAY 31, 1921

[The visitors mentioned in the Resolution were the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of Peterborough, and the Primus of the Scottish Episcopal Church.]

That the Moderator convey to His Grace the Archbishop and his Episcopal Brethren here present the warmest thanks of the General Assembly for their visit and addresses, and that it be remitted to the Committee on Church and Nation to take into serious consideration the Lambeth 'Appeal to All Christian People', and the statements made to-day by his Grace and his brother Bishops, and to report to next General Assembly.

50. *The Church of Scotland*

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CHURCH AND NATION APPROVED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, MAY 24, 1922 THE LAMBETH PROPOSALS

The remit is contained in the following resolution of the General Assembly :

' That the Moderator convey to his Grace the Archbishop and his Episcopal Brethren here present the warmest thanks of the General Assembly for their visit and addresses, and that it be remitted to the Committee on Church and Nation to take into serious consideration the Lambeth "Appeal to all Christian People", and the statements made to-day by his Grace and his brother Bishops, and to report to next General Assembly.'

The proposals for a reunited Catholic Church are contained in an 'Appeal to all Christian People' from the

Archbishops, Bishops Metropolitan, and other Bishops of the Holy Catholic Church in full communion with the Church of England assembled in the Lambeth Conference, 1920. While the cordial invitation to consider the Appeal was extended to the Venerable the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland by his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, who very courteously presented it in person, it has to be kept in mind that the proposals for Reunion contained in the Appeal come with the authority of responsible representatives of the various national, regional, and provincial Churches within the Anglican Communion. Emanating from such a source the Appeal may be regarded as one of the most important of the many recent expressions of the spirit of reconciliation for which we have cause to give thanks to God.

The Church of Scotland rejoices in the noble vision of a reunited Church adumbrated in the Appeal. The best evidence of its earnest sympathy with this and every serious endeavour to heal the broken fellowships of the Church is to be found in the fact that for several years it has been engaged in the task of advancing the great object of Presbyterian Reunion in Scotland. In the seventh of the Articles declaratory of the constitution of the Church of Scotland in matters spiritual, 'The Church of Scotland, believing it to be the will of Christ that His disciples should be all one in the Father and in Him, that the world may believe that the Father has sent Him, recognizes the obligation to seek and promote union with other Churches in which it finds the Word to be purely preached, the sacraments administered according to Christ's ordinance, and discipline rightly exercised.'

While the negotiations for Reunion, in which it is at present engaged, must, as will be readily understood, claim its immediate attention, the Church of Scotland humbly recognizes its duty as a Church of Christ to give

sympathetic and serious consideration to the responsible proposals contained in the Appeal issued by the Anglican Communion ; and would, on the first convenient occasion, welcome an unrestricted conference with representatives of the Church of England and of the Scottish Episcopal Church, from whom it has received such a cordial invitation ; with the view of arriving at a better understanding of each other's position, and of thoroughly exploring the possibilities of restoring the visible unity of the Church of Christ, on the lines that such a Conference, under the guidance of the promised Spirit of God, might direct.

The General Assembly receive and approve the report on the Lambeth Appeal, and request the Moderator to transmit the same to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury.

51. The United Free Church of Scotland

RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

MAY 31, 1921

The General Assembly cordially welcomes the presence of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Bishop of Peterborough, and the Most Reverend the Primus of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, the Deputation from the Anglican Episcopate with reference to the recent Appeal issued by the Lambeth Conference of July 1920, on the subject of Reunion. The Assembly have listened with great respect and sympathy to the statements addressed to them by these honoured brethren in the interests of the object so permanent in the teaching and revealed purposes of the Churches' Lord, and so deeply concerning their well-being and the power and fruitfulness of their testimony among men, and they desire, not only to reciprocate the earnest brotherly kindness with which these statements have been made, but also to cherish the sacred aspirations

which they convey, and to be ready at all times, as opportunity offers and as the will of the Lord shall be discovered to them, to give effect to it, and they remit the said Appeal to the Commission on Faith and Order, with instructions to submit a considered response to the same at the next General Assembly.

52. *The United Free Church of Scotland*

RESPONSE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND TO THE LAMBETH APPEAL

(MAY 29, 1922)

The General Assembly desire to express the sincere respect and thankfulness with which they have received the 'Appeal to all Christian People', issued by the Archbishops and Bishops assembled in the Lambeth Conference of 1920, and so impressively commended to the consideration of this Church at last General Assembly by his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Peterborough, and the Most Reverend the Primus of the Episcopal Church in Scotland.

The matter thus urged upon the attention of all the faithful is one, the Assembly realize, which profoundly concerns the wellbeing of the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ and the power of its witness among men. We associate ourselves with our brethren, who have been moved to issue this Appeal, in humble acknowledgement of the evils attending the present divided state of Christendom. The causes leading to it are very various, and we cordially agree that not all of these have been blameworthy. Nevertheless, in the perspective of the present the separations of the past have come, in many cases, to be judged differently; and the clamant necessities of the world at this hour are felt urgently to demand the reconsideration, and if possible

the removal, of divisions not plainly based on principle and conscience. We count it a happy thing that tendencies and movements of the kind are an outstanding characteristic of the times in which we live. And we recognize in the present Appeal a conspicuous instance of what we reverently believe to be a working of the Spirit of God in the mind and life of His Church which is full of promise alike for the present and for future days.

The Assembly are deeply aware that more even than considerations of the highest expediency is involved in this matter. The advantages of Christian unity are many and obvious, but beyond and above these is the express purpose and desire of our Lord Himself. The obligations resting upon His Church are manifold ; and the rightful adjustment of these, in particular the harmonizing of the claims of outward unity with other claims, has at many stages of her history been found singularly difficult of attainment. Yet the revealed will of the Church's Lord abides. The inward or spiritual unity in Him of all the faithful stands fast. But their duty to exhibit this visibly to the world also remains, and we dare not fail to seek after the fulfilment of it. Assuredly much must be at fault, and many things will be lacking, until this be accomplished : the oneness of the members of Christ's Body will tend to be forgotten in the differences which divide them, the life of the body must be impoverished, and the faith of the world hindered.

The General Assembly, accordingly, welcome the vision which has been brought before them of 'a Church, genuinely catholic, loyal to all truth, and gathering into its fellowship all who profess and call themselves Christians, within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present, shall be possessed in common and made serviceable to the whole Body of Christ '. They gratefully acknowledge the service rendered by their brethren in anew presenting to the consideration of

Christians everywhere a conception of the Church so inspiring. And they earnestly profess their willingness to seek with them to know how, in the circumstances of the present time, its realization may be advanced.

Manifestly questions of the gravest and most far-reaching importance at once arise here—questions with regard to the form and manner in which such visible unity of the existing ‘particular Churches’ shall embody and express itself. How far is an outward uniformity among them implied in it? And how shall the unity desired be combined with the preservation of the gifts and attainments which each regards as its special heritage? The Assembly recognize that, no doubt designedly, and with entire propriety, such questions, for the most part, are not dealt with in the Appeal itself. Their right resolution can be found only through that high ‘adventure’ of faith and goodwill to which it invites.

Meanwhile the General Assembly note the leading conditions which, in the belief of their brethren, the effort to achieve the visible unity of the Church must observe; and with the position so indicated the Assembly have no hesitation in saying that they are in general agreement. This Church also receives the Word of God as the supreme rule of faith and life, and has ever held in reverent estimation the Nicene Symbol and the Apostles’ Creed; it receives the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord’s Supper as divinely instituted means of grace; and it regards the Ministry as the gift of the Lord to His Church, a sacred office to be filled by those who, being inwardly called, have also been duly ordained thereto. Important differences, it is true, have prevailed with regard to each of these—differences reaching so far and spreading so deep as to disturb, and even destroy, outward unity. The last named especially, involving as it does questions concerning the character and functions of the Ministerial Office, the conditions of valid entrance thereon, and the relation of its

rights and duties to those of the general membership of the Church, has been the fruitful source of grave divergence among brethren, and the separations thus occasioned have been found peculiarly hard to overcome. The conception held by the Presbyterian Churches of what the mind of Christ requires or permits in such matters is well known, and need not now be indicated. Nor would it be proper, at the present stage, to pronounce upon the adequacy of the suggestion made by the Anglican Episcopate—in a spirit which all must appreciate—in order to deal with this outstanding difficulty. What is thankfully observed is that the proposal is submitted as one for frank and friendly consideration. Contemplated conference is, we understand, to be unrestricted in scope and character. Discussion is to proceed upon the footing that ‘our several ministries’ are in no case to be ‘disowned’ but rather acknowledged as having been manifestly blessed and owned of God; and examination of all matters involved in the problem of Reunion is to go forward in mutual deference to one another’s conscientious views of truth and duty. To such an approach made at the call of loyalty to the common Lord and in a spirit of consideration so brotherly, this Church cannot but respond with readiness and cordiality.

The General Assembly, accordingly, earnestly welcome the Appeal to all Christian people issued by the Archbishops and Bishops assembled in the recent Lambeth Conference. We desire to hear in it the summons of the one Lord to renewed endeavour after the healing of the divisions of His Church, and the achievement of a fuller manifestation of its unity of faith and life in Him. And we hereby declare our hearty willingness to enter into conference with the brethren from whom this Appeal has been received, that, under the guidance of His Spirit, we may together learn our Lord’s will in this high matter, and therein glorify His Name.

The Assembly approve and adopt the Response to the Appeal to all Christian People for unity issued by the Archbishops and Bishops of the Anglican Communion assembled at the Lambeth Conference of 1920 ; they instruct that the Response be communicated to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury ; and they empower the Committee to make arrangements for any Conference which may be proposed in terms of the said Response, and to report thereon to the Commission of Assembly at any of its stated diets or to the next General Assembly.

The Assembly remind their faithful people of the abiding obligations of Christian unity, and of the duty, more especially in the circumstances of the present time, to seek for a fuller manifestation thereof, as in God's good providence the way shall open ; and recommend that this important matter be constantly kept in view in the ordinary services and meetings for worship in the Church.

The Assembly appoint the following to be members of the Committee : Professors D. S. Cairns, H. A. A. Kennedy, H. R. Mackintosh, A. B. Macaulay, and J. A. Robertson ; Dr. Adam Philip, Dr. R. S. Simpson—*Ministers* : Mr. F. A. Brown Douglas, Mr. J. A. Roxburgh, Mr. Hugh Barnett, Sir Charles Chalmers, Col. J. M. Denny, Mr. J. Duncan Millar—*Elders*.

VIII. THE CHURCH OF SWEDEN

53. *The Reply of the Bishops of the Church of Sweden*

TO THE CONFERENCE OF BISHOPS IN THE ANGLICAN
COMMUNION

April 1922.

[See Resolutions 24 and 25 of the Lambeth Conference, 1920]

With deep and sincere satisfaction we have received the resolution adopted by the Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion, holden at Lambeth in London during the summer 1920, wherein this Conference recommends that members of the Swedish Church, qualified to receive the Sacrament in their own Church, should be admitted to Holy Communion in the Anglican Church, as well as that on suitable occasions permission should be given to Swedish ecclesiastics to give addresses in churches belonging to the Anglican Communion. That the Lambeth Conference, after long and thoroughgoing negotiations which have taken place in this matter during recent years, now for its own part has found the time come for a closer connexion between the two Churches, of such a kind as from its most important feature might be characterized as intercommunion, this is to us a source of real joy, because we see therein a step towards that great goal for which we pray and strive with you : that the unity which has always existed and exists between all true disciples of Christ, should be better realized than hitherto also in external matters, and also because of the direct and practical importance, which such a connexion must have for the work

to which our Church is called, for the pastoral task which is imposed upon her by the Lord of the Church even for those of its members who live outside the borders of their own country, and thus also and particularly for those who live within the British Empire.

The question of the terms of communion between two Churches has not been the object of general discussions and resolutions among us to the same extent as among you, for reasons which will appear from the following pages. But from the practice which has been followed hitherto in this matter by our Church, these two principles might be drawn : (1) To individual members of foreign communions who have desired more occasionally to take part in Holy Communion in our Church for the strengthening of their inner life, this right has been conceded as a duty of charity. A refusal of this right in such cases, *in casu necessitatis*, will hardly have occurred in our Church. (2) A concession of this right *in genere* to the members of a certain communion, on the other hand, presupposes that an essential agreement, proved by the confessional documents of the communion in question, exists as regards the spirit and the main points of Christian faith. In the case of those communions which, like our own, have accepted the *Confessio Augustana*, the concession of such general intercommunion has been considered as quite natural, while in other cases the matter has been thought to demand a particular inquiry. But that the direct acceptance of the *Confessio Augustana* has not been considered in all cases as the necessary condition for the concession of intercommunion is shown also by the fact, which has a particular interest in this case, that already once before, from the seventeenth century, intercommunion of this kind has existed in North America between our Church and yours. Two centuries later, during some years after 1866, Swedish emigrants to the United States were recommended to the Protestant Episcopal Church in such

places where there was no access to a Swedish Evangelic Lutheran community.¹

Thus, in the question of intercommunion our Church has not attached decisive weight either to the doctrine of the ministry in general or to what is usually called the Apostolical Succession of Bishops and the questions thereby implied. The deeper reason for this is derived from our fundamental conceptions, and has been explained several times during the preparatory investigations, and particularly during the negotiations in Upsala in September 1909, by the representatives of the Swedish Church. For the explanation of this position, which we think that we ought also now to emphasize, we refer to the points with regard to the doctrine of the Swedish Church on the ministry that were on that occasion laid before the Committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1909, and form part of the report issued in 1911 by this Committee.² From these points we quote :

‘ 3. No particular organization of the Church and of its ministry is instituted *iure divino*, not even the order and discipline and state of things recorded in the New Testament, because the Holy Scriptures, the *norma normans* of the faith of the Church, are no law, but vindicate for the

¹ In the circular letter of the Clerus Comitalis to the clergy from the Diet of 1865-6, it was recommended that a testimonial to this effect should be given to emigrants. Amongst the reasons for this it is said ‘ that a Bishop of the English Episcopal Church in the United States, now present in our capital, has given us the kindest assurances that such of our countrymen as go to places where there are no Evangelical Lutheran Communities, may be sure to find necessary assistance in matters spiritual as well as temporal at the hands of the clergy of the English Church, if they choose to apply to them, without the slightest attempt being made by the English Church to imbue them with other doctrines than those which our Church confesses, or to separate them in any respect from this Church ’.

² See *The Church of England and the Church of Sweden* (Mowbray), 1911, p. 18. [Editor.]

New Covenant the great principle of Christian freedom, unweariedly asserted by St. Paul against every form of legal religion, and applied with fresh strength and clearness by Luther, but instituted by our Saviour Himself, as, for instance, when, in taking farewell of His disciples, He did not regulate their future work by *a priori* rules and institutions, but directed them to the guidance of the Paraclete, the Holy Ghost.

‘4. The object of any organization and of the whole ministry being included in the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments—according to the fifth article of the *Augustana*, God has instituted *ministerium docendi evangelii et porrigendi sacramenta*—our Church cannot recognize any essential difference, *de iure divino*, of aim and authority between the two or three Orders into which the ministry of grace may have been divided, *iure humano*, for the benefit and convenience of the Church.

‘5. The value of every organization of the *ministerium ecclesiasticum*, and of the Church in general, is only to be judged by its fitness and ability to become a pure vessel for the supernatural contents, and a perfect channel for the way of Divine Revelation unto mankind.

‘6. That doctrine in no wise makes our Church indifferent to the organization and the forms of ministry which the cravings and experiences of the Christian community have produced under the guidance of the Spirit in the course of history. We do not only regard the peculiar forms and traditions of our Church with the reverence due to a venerable legacy from the past, but we realize in them a blessing from the God of history accorded to us.’

From the conception of our Church regarding the ministry which has been declared here again, it follows that for us decisive importance must be attached, not to any questions of a more formal character, but to the question whether and how far the two communities agree in these

ideas as to the content of that message of salvation, founded on the divine revelation, which has been committed to both of them. The differences which no doubt can be found here must be neither overrated nor underrated. The difference as to the emphasis laid on the doctrine of the ministry, which has appeared above, might point to a certain discrepancy even in matters that have a more central position according to our valuation. Another point which presents itself to the mind when the question of intercommunion is raised, is the difference which, according to the confessions of both Churches, exists in their conception of the Lord's Supper itself. The judgement of the extent of this difference is made more difficult by the fact, which has appeared also during the preparatory negotiations, that evidently within the Anglican Church itself different doctrines are held on these two questions.

Yet, and without any wish to belittle the difference that exists between the two Churches, we do not hesitate to pronounce as our opinion that during the course of the preparatory negotiations, and so far as we have gradually got to know more about the Anglican Church, our impression of that unity which binds the two Churches together in what is deepest and most central, has become predominant. In the Church and the congregation of Christ, as in every living body, real concord is not characterized by uniformity, but by unity in diversity. A detailed definition of those matters in which this concord appears cannot be attempted here. But yet we do not feel justified in premitting briefly to call attention to two points, which are to us more decisive than all others, with regard to the purity of the Christian doctrine—viz., the recognition of Scripture as *norma normans* both with regard to life and doctrine, and the building of our salvation on God's grace alone received by faith.

The first of those principles means to us that in matters

of faith no other authority must be put directly or indirectly above or, which is the same thing, on a level with the prophetic and apostolic word in Holy Scripture, as the message preserved to us of the works of God for the salvation of man in that history of salvation, wherein the all-commanding centre which everything else presages or points back to is Jesus Christ. The prophetic and apostolic message has sprung out of the revelation of God Himself and is itself a part of this revelation. All later expressions of Christian faith, however great their value may be, are to be considered only as more or less reliable guides to or, in the words of the *Formula Concordiae*, 'witnesses' of this revelation, witnesses whose verdicts must always be tested, by the experience of the Church and of the individual Christian, in the light of the revelation itself, which is recorded, confessed, and interpreted in the prophetic and apostolic message, and is only thus accessible to us.

When we put beside the principle of revelation the principle of faith or grace, this is at bottom not another principle by the side of the first, but we mean only thereby to make the content of revelation more clear from a certain point of view. The revelation is throughout essentially a revelation of God's prevenient and unconditional grace, precedent to and independent of all human endeavour—that is, a revelation of the love of God, which, while condemning sin, searches for the sinner and restores him with His forgiveness. What we want to express by this is not only one, not even the most central, of those Christian doctrines which have grown out of the divine revelation, but the fundamental direction and meaning of God's whole activity for salvation, whereby He has revealed Himself to us, and has, in spite of our sin, opened to us in Jesus Christ His paternal bosom. The revelation has no other meaning that could be put on a level with this: everything else that we derive from it is only a consequence of this. And when we

combine the grace of God and the faith of man in a close connexion, we mean only to determine thereby more fully the nature of prevenient grace against all pelagianizing tendencies. Faith means to us not something which man has to do that might precede and be a condition of God's grace and remission of sins, but faith is only that *ὄργανον ληπτικόν* which is created by God's grace, and whereby God's grace is received by man : out of the revelation of God's love in Christ Jesus our trust in this love is born, and by that it is sustained. The new moral life is a fruit of this communion with God, which has been opened to us independently of any works of man. Our moral life is not the condition of, and does not sustain, our religious relationship to God, but it is rather conditioned and sustained thereby. ' Good works ' are, to speak with Luther, not the condition of blessedness, but that blessedness, which is prepared for us in spite of our sin, when we are called to be the children of God, is the condition without which ' good works ' cannot be done at all. That those two principles, which we began this letter by discerning, are fundamentally one is made still more manifest by contemplating the opposites, which are denied by them. If the principle of revelation turns in the first place against any form of institutionalism and legalism (nomism), the principle of faith or of grace has primarily in view all sorts of pelagianism. But then institutionalism, nomism, and pelagianism are only different aspects of that one fundamental conception which is totally denied by us. Both principles could be most simply combined in this : Between God and the soul, or which is the same to us, between Christ and the faith, nothing, no third principle, no institution, no law, no proper works, must intervene.

The same conception is contained in its outlines, so far as we have been able to see, partly in the sixth, partly in the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth of the Thirty-nine Articles.

We are convinced that between our branches of the Universal Church of Christ, notwithstanding the shades of opinion that may exist, there is an essential unity in that fundamental conception which we have now briefly indicated, and to which we unswervingly adhere. In this conviction we accept with fraternal confidence the outstretched hand. We rejoice at the decision of the Anglican Bishops, and on our side we approve of the practice that members of the Anglican Communion, qualified to receive the Sacrament in their own Church, should be admitted to Holy Communion in our Church, as well as that on suitable occasions permission should be given to Anglican ecclesiastics to give addresses in our churches and there to perform religious functions.

To this general answer we ought to add a few words about some special questions, mentioned in the resolutions of the Lambeth Conference and in the report of a Special Committee, by which the resolutions were prepared :

1. With regard to Resolution 25 of the Conference, where it is recommended that in the event of an invitation being extended to an Anglican Bishop or Bishops to take part in the consecration of a Swedish Bishop, the invitation should, if possible, be accepted, subject to approval of the Metropolitan, we express our satisfaction that a wish, expressed by the Archbishop of Canterbury in a letter of August 11, 1920, to the Archbishop of Upsala, when communicating to him the Lambeth resolutions—viz., that for the future a reciprocal assistance of Bishops from one of the Churches at the consecration of Bishops in the other might be practised when a suitable occasion presents itself—has now already begun to be put into practice by the assistance of two Anglican Bishops at the consecration of two Swedish Bishops in Upsala on September 19, 1920.¹ We recommend,

¹ The Bishops of Durham and Peterborough took part in the consecration of the Bishops of Västerås and Visby. [Editor.]

further, that in case such an invitation to take part in the consecration of an Anglican Bishop should be extended to a Swedish Bishop, it should, if possible, be accepted, subject to the approval of the Archbishop.

2. The Committee appointed by the Lambeth Conference to report on these questions gives expression in its report to two desiderata which were discussed already in the preliminary negotiations in Upsala in September 1909. They concern, firstly, the establishment in the Church of Sweden of a Diaconate of the same kind as that existing in the Anglican Communion; and, secondly, the introduction, likewise in accordance with the Anglican practice, of the laying-on of hands as an outward sign of grace given in Confirmation.

With regard to these two desiderata, which, as we notice, have neither now nor formerly been made in any way conditional for intercommunion, we wish to make the following brief statements :

(a) In our Church we do not now possess any Order exactly corresponding to the Anglican Diaconate. For a number of years, however, we have had among us a male Diaconate for the service of charity among the sick, the infirm, the poor, the lost, thus of the same character as the Diaconate of women, which is older and more amply developed among us. In Resolution 49 of the Lambeth Conference, this Diaconate is said to be the primitive one in the Christian Church, a statement which is undoubtedly true according to Acts vi. No need of or wish for a Diaconate as an introduction to the ministry has been expressed in our Church.

(b) The question about laying-on of hands in Confirmation has, in our opinion, decidedly the character of an adiaphoron. Consequently, we have no scruples against the use of this beautiful rite, which is practised in our Church on other occasions; on the other hand, we cannot accept it if

supported by arguments that would in any way question its character of an adiaphoron.

In this connexion we do not feel justified in pretermittting to draw your attention to the very great importance that our Church attaches to the thorough instruction of the first communicants in the fundamentals of the Christian faith, as being an indispensable condition for Confirmation—a requirement that does not seem to be paid the same attention in the Anglican practice of Confirmation. Against the admission to the Lord's Supper in our Church of persons confirmed in the Anglican Church, hesitation has earlier been expressed among us because of the duty of instruction laid on the Church in Matt. xxviii. 20. Nevertheless, this has not prevented admission to Holy Communion in our Church for those confirmed in the Anglican Church. We are of opinion that both Churches may have something to learn from each other, both with regard to the preparation for Confirmation and to the act itself and its significance. Thus, what has been said about the instruction of the first communicants must be considered as a desideratum, but not as a condition for intercommunion.

3. Lastly, in order to prevent any misunderstanding, we have to draw your attention to the fact that the Augustana Synod in North America and the Tamil Evangelical Lutheran Church in South India, which may be considered as daughter communities of the Church of Sweden, and with which our Church has intercommunion and a very intimate fellowship also in other respects, are nevertheless quite independent Churches, so that no conclusions with regard to them can be drawn from agreements made by the Church of Sweden for the promotion of unity in the Church of Christ.

May God give His blessing to the more intimate connexion between our Churches that we are now establishing, and may the Church of Christ in our countries from this connexion reap rich fruits for her spiritual life.

May we thus also be made better fitted to become instruments in the hand of God for the establishing of the bond of unity and peace between the disciples of Christ all over the earth !

STOCKHOLM,

April 21, 1922.

Signed on behalf of the Conference of Bishops of the Church of Sweden, holden at Sankta Clara, Stockholm, April 20 to 21, 1922.

NATHAN SÖDERBLOM

Archbishop of Upsala.

GOTTFRID BILLING

Bishop of Lund.

HJ1 DANELL

Bishop of Skara.

Swedish Bishops Conference Delegation.

IX. CHURCHES HOLDING THE PRESBYTERIAN SYSTEM

54. The General Council of the Alliance of the Reformed Churches throughout the world holding the Presbyterian System

RESOLUTIONS ON THE LAMBETH APPEAL Pittsburg, September 21, 1921

1. The Council, having taken into consideration the 'Statement and Appeal' issued by the Lambeth Conference of 1920, recognizes and welcomes the earnestness of purpose and brotherliness of spirit manifested therein, and it cordially responds to the call to closer fellowship among the various branches of the Church of Christ.

2. The responsibility of giving formal answer to the invitation contained in this Appeal must, so far as the Churches holding the Presbyterian Order are concerned, rest with the Supreme Courts of these Churches. This Council is not a legislative Court; but it may and does express the hope that the Churches it represents will be able to meet in conference with our brethren of Lambeth, in the spirit of prayer and of willingness to learn to gather the mind of Christ concerning the peace and unity of His Church on earth.

3. The Council records its opinion that any such conference must be as between Churches meeting on equal terms and must be unrestricted as to all questions of ecclesiastical order. Further, its members are at one in declaring their conviction that there will be substantial progress towards reunion only when the conferring Churches are ready

frankly to recognize one another's Church standing, and to accompany words of unity by acts of unity in the fellowship of the Lord's Table and in co-operation in the Lord's work.

4. The Council earnestly commends this whole matter to the interest and prayers of believing people, and appeals to the members of all Churches which it represents, to promote the great ends of unity by avoiding and discouraging all divisive speech and action among Christians, and by co-operation with members of other Churches in worship and work, that it may be made manifest that the Church is one in Christ Jesus.

X. EAST AFRICA

55. *The Alliance of Missionary Societies in Kenya Colony*

RESOLUTIONS ON THE LAMBETH APPEAL

Adopted by a Conference of the Alliance at Kikuyu,
January 23-27, 1922

RESOLUTION I.

The Conference, having had placed before them the Lambeth Appeal for Reunion, and the Report of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches in England, and also having heard statements regarding action taken in this connexion by the Church of Scotland, and Joint Committees of the Churches in England, thank God for the real advance made in the matter of Reunion, and pray that further progress may be steady and rapid.

But they feel with all the strength of conviction that it is their insistent duty to endeavour to the utmost to remove the disabilities which are to a large extent preventing the formation of a United Church in Kenya Colony and Protectorate, especially among the Native Christians. They believe that it is not even yet too late to achieve in this still, to a large extent, virgin field a triumph for Christ in avoiding the disgrace of imposing a perplexing and weakening sectarianism upon those to whom the various Churches are endeavouring to communicate the one Gospel of their one Lord.

As a definite and decisive step in this direction they would urge that in all future ordinations of African Ministers the various Churches accepting the basis of the Alliance should be represented by those authorized to ordain in the various Churches, who should participate in the actual ordination

so that all African Ministers so ordained would be fully recognized as Ministers in all the Churches concerned

They earnestly appeal to their Home Churches to sanction such an arrangement as early as possible and would urge that as far as possible all fresh missionaries be ordained in the same way.

This necessarily raises the question of the mutual recognition of the Ordained Foreign Missionaries already working in the country. The Conference earnestly appeals to the leaders of the Churches at Home to give them the freedom which would make such mutual recognition possible.

Further the Conference feels that the Church cannot be considered a truly United Church so long as Communicant Members of one Branch of the Church cannot become Communicant Members of another without a special religious ceremony being required.

They ask the Representative Council of the Alliance carefully to consider these Resolutions and to draw up definite proposals for their practical working out and for their submission to the Authorities concerned.

RESOLUTION II

In view of it being the express aim of the Alliance to work for the foundation of a United Church and the fact that local Churches are now in existence with their Governing Bodies distinct from the Missionary Societies, such Governing Bodies be invited to become members of the Alliance or to send representatives to sit as Associate Members of the Representative Council of the Alliance. And that, as the first application of this principle, the Diocesan Synod of the Church of England and the Presbytery of the Church of Scotland in Kenya Colony be invited to join or become associate with the Alliance.

XI. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

56. *Agreement on the Affiliation between the Hungarian Reformed Church in America and the Protestant Episcopal Church*

OCTOBER 1921

[The Hungarian Reformed Church was organized in New York in 1904 out of the numerous Hungarian congregations which had been formed as a result of Hungarian immigration into the United States. It was the direct result of a visit on behalf of the Church in Hungary paid by Count Joseph Degenfeld, Curator General of the Reformed Church in Hungary, to discuss ways in which these American-Hungarian congregations might be connected with the Mother Church in Hungary and receive assistance from it. Since the War, however, the financial and other help which had come from Hungary is no longer forthcoming; hence this approach to the Protestant Episcopal Church by one of the two *classes* 'Eastern' and 'Western' into which it is divided. The Agreement was signed by the official representatives of both Churches, including the Bishops of Bethlehem, Newark, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and S.W. Virginia, and twelve Hungarian Reformed Clergy and sixteen Hungarian Laymen.]

AGREEMENT made this nineteenth day of October 1921 between those Parishes and Missions of the Reformed Church of Hungary, located in the United States, whose names are affixed hereto, of the first part; those clergy of the said Church who shall sign this AGREEMENT, of the second part; those Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, whose names are affixed hereto, of the third part; and the Presiding Bishop and Council of the said Protestant Episcopal Church, of the fourth part:

WHEREAS, The Parishes and Missions, parties of the first part hereto, are church organizations ministering principally

to the religious needs of Magyars resident in the United States, in accordance with the doctrine, discipline and worship of the Reformed Church of Hungary ; and

WHEREAS, Said Parishes and Missions have been heretofore supported in whole or in part by said Reformed Church of Hungary, but said Reformed Church of Hungary is no longer able to continue to support them ; and

WHEREAS, Said Parishes and Missions have acquired valuable property, more particularly described in the Schedule hereto attached ; and

WHEREAS, Said Parishes and Missions desire Episcopal care, oversight and support, and the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, parties of the third part hereto, are willing to give said Parishes and Missions such care, oversight and support on the terms hereinafter set forth ; and

WHEREAS, Some questions have arisen as to the validity of the ordination of the clergy of the Reformed Church of Hungary now ministering to said Parishes and Missions from the standpoint of the said Protestant Episcopal Church ;

NOW THIS AGREEMENT WITNESSETH :

1. Each of the Parishes and Missions, parties of the first part hereto, hereby submits itself to the spiritual oversight and jurisdiction of the Bishop within whose diocese such Parish or Mission is located.

2. The clergy of said Parishes and Missions, parties of the second part hereto, without repudiating their existing Orders, agree to accept additional ordination at the hands of the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, having met the requirements of said Church.

3. Each of said Parishes and Missions will cause such changes to be made in its Articles of Association, or, where it is incorporated under the civil law, in its Charter, as will secure the present congregation the control of its property.

4. Said Parishes and Missions may organize themselves into an organization to be known as the Magyar Convocation or Classis with a presiding officer who shall be known as the Dean of the Convocation or Classis and shall be appointed annually by the Presiding Bishop and Council upon nomination of the Convocation or Classis and confirmation by the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, parties of the third part herein, or their successors in office.

Said Dean shall have the direction of the work of Church Extension among the Magyars and shall serve as counsellor in the affairs of said Parishes and Missions and shall act for them in all matters of their common interest. He shall systematically visit each Parish and Mission and shall receive and transmit to the Presiding Bishop and Council the reports of such Parishes and Missions as to the progress of their work in such detail as from time to time may be required. He shall report at stated intervals to the Bishop of each diocese of the Protestant Episcopal Church within whose jurisdiction he shall work and shall furnish duplicates of such reports to the Presiding Bishop and Council. He shall be subordinate in each diocese to the Protestant Episcopal Bishop thereof. His stipend shall be paid by the Presiding Bishop and Council.

5. The title to any property held by or for any of said Parishes or Missions shall always be held subject to the control of the members thereof, subject to the following limitations. Provided that no real estate, the title to which is held by or for any such Parish or Mission, shall be alienated or encumbered except with the consent in writing both of the Bishop within whose diocese such property is located and the Dean of the Convocation or Classis upon authorization by the Convocation or Classis with which such Parish or Mission is associated, so long as such Parish or Mission continues to be connected therewith ; but if any such Parish or Mission shall cease for any reason to be con-

nected with such Convocation or Classis, then no such real estate shall be alienated or encumbered except in conformity with the requirements of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese in which such property is located.

6. Where a Parish or Mission is not incorporated or otherwise legally qualified to hold property and the title to any real estate is held by any corporation or individual as trustees for the same, the legal title to the property of such Parish or Mission shall be vested in a corporation or Board of Trustees satisfactory to the Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese in which the property of such Parish or Mission is located and to the Magyar Convocation or Classis aforesaid ; such title to be held subject to the same trusts under which such properties are now held for said Parish or Mission.

7. Each Bishop party hereto undertakes to extend Episcopal oversight, care and support to those of said Parishes and Missions which are within his diocese, upon the same basis as he shall from time to time extend such oversight, care and support to Parishes and Missions therein located, originally organized as members of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

8. Each Bishop party hereto will license the use within his Diocese by the Parishes and Missions parties hereto and therein located of the Order of Service and Liturgy and also ceremonial and ornaments of the Reformed Church of Hungary, provided that in the Celebration of the Holy Communion the words of the Prayer of Consecration used in the Liturgy of the Protestant Episcopal Church, or an approved Hungarian translation of the same, shall at all times be used, and provided such Order of Service and Liturgy shall at all times conform to principles laid down by the Lambeth Conference, as follows :

‘ The Holy Scriptures, as the record of God’s revelation of Himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard

of faith ; and the Creed commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and either it or the Apostles' Creed as the Baptismal confession of belief ;

' The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ ;

' A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church, as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body.'

9. The validity of Baptism and the sufficiency for admission to Holy Communion of Confirmation as heretofore administered by the clergy of the Reformed Church of Hungary in the United States shall be accepted by the Bishops parties hereto, subject to proof of the actual administration of such Sacraments in any case where they may deem it necessary. But hereafter in all such Parishes and Missions, Confirmation shall be administered by Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church only or by other Bishops in full communion with said Church.

10. Any clergy of said Reformed Church of Hungary ordained as Deacons or Priests by Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church on the terms above specified, and canonically connected with any diocese of said Church, shall become thereby entitled to the benefit of the provisions of the Canons or other undertakings of any such diocese as to the salaries of clergy so canonically connected, and also to the benefit of any Pension Fund to which any other clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in like status shall be then entitled.

11. Each Parish and Mission shall continue to exercise the right to select its Minister, subject to the approval of the Bishop of the diocese in which its property is located.

12. If at any time any of said Parishes or Missions shall desire to be admitted into union with the Diocesan Convention of the diocese in which it is located, it shall be

admitted (on compliance with the regular requirements of said diocese) on the same terms that Parishes or Missions originally organized as members of the Protestant Episcopal Church shall be then admitted.

13. Any Parish or Mission of the Reformed Church of Hungary other than those parties hereto may become a party to this Agreement ; and such Parish or Mission and the clergy thereof may become entitled to all the benefits hereof upon executing this Agreement or a duplicate thereof and upon complying with its terms ; provided that the Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese in which the property of such Parish or Mission is located shall have also executed this Agreement.

57. *The Protestant Episcopal Church*
General Convention 1922

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS

I

(September 15, 1922)

That the House of Bishops desires to give its hearty endorsement to the 'Appeal to all Christian People' put forth by the Lambeth Conference of 1920, and to commend it to the prayerful study and effort of all Christians. With this end in view, we desire to encourage the holding of group conferences, both among our own members and also in connexion with the representatives of other Christian Bodies, to consider the whole question of the visible and organic unity of the Church of Christ, and to pledge themselves to labour for its realization.

II

(September 21, 1922)

That the House of Bishops in Convention assembled desire to call the attention of all Christian people and especially the members of our own Church to the great spiritual appeal for their penitential and prayerful association for the furtherance of unity among all Christians.

The Appeal declares that the Will of God is human fellowship and His purpose is the manifestation of this fellowship in an outward visible and united society, holding one Faith, having its own officers, using God-given means of grace, and inspiring all its members to the world-wide service of the Kingdom of God. This is what is meant by the Catholic Church ; that the time has come for all the separated groups of Christians to agree in forgetting the things which are behind and reaching out towards the goal of a reunited Catholic Church.

Therefore the Appeal calls upon Christian people to make an effort to meet the demands of a new age with a new outlook, and that conferences be held in various places between the representatives of different communions, in order that better knowledge and complete understanding may lead under the guidance of the Holy Spirit to real unity of life and service.

The House of Bishops thanks God for the spiritual reality of this Appeal, for its broad vision and sincere purpose, and, without adopting as its own all the statements and proposals in the Appeal, heartily commends it to all Christian people.

58. *The Protestant Episcopal Church*

CANON II

OF THE ORDINATION OF DEACONS AND PRIESTS IN SPECIAL CASES

(Adopted by the General Convention, September 1922)

[Certain Proposals for an Approach towards Unity, generally known as the Concordat, were issued in March 1919, by ten members of the Protestant Episcopal Church and eleven members of Congregational Churches in the United States of America, including in a schedule the form of a proposed Canon. These Proposals were submitted to the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in September 1919, and referred to a Joint Commission with certain instructions. That Joint Commission reported to the General Convention in September 1922, and after considerable debate a new Canon was adopted as below.]

1. In case any Minister who has not received episcopal ordination shall desire to receive such orders from a Bishop of this Church to the Diaconate and to the Priesthood without giving up or denying his fellowship or his ministry in the Communion to which he belongs, the Bishop of the Diocese or Missionary District in which he lives, with the advice and consent of the Standing Committee or the Council of Advice, may confirm and ordain him; *provided*, also, that the congregation, if any, in which such Minister officiates, shall declare, through its proper representatives, its desire for such ordination on behalf of its Minister, and its purpose to receive in future the ministrations and the Sacraments of one who shall have been ordained to the Priesthood by a Bishop.

2. The Minister desiring to be so ordained shall satisfy the Bishop that he has resided in the United States at least one year; that he has been duly baptized with water in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; that he holds the historic faith of the Church as contained

in the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed ; that there is no sufficient objection on grounds physical, mental, moral or spiritual ; that the Ecclesiastical Authority to which he is subject in the Communion to which he belongs consents to such ordination ; that he shall not knowingly admit to the Holy Communion any person who has not been baptized with water in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost ; and further, the Bishop shall charge him that this Church hopefully anticipates the use of the Apostolic practice of Confirmation among his people.

3. At the time of such ordination the person so to be ordained shall subscribe and make in the presence of the Bishop a declaration that he believes the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God and to contain all things necessary to salvation ; that in the ministration of Baptism he will unfailingly baptize with water in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. He shall also undertake that in the celebration of the Holy Communion he will invariably use the elements of bread and wine, and will include in the service (a) a Prayer of Consecration, embodying the words and acts of our Lord in the Institution of the Sacrament, an Offering, an Invocation of the Holy Spirit, and a Thanksgiving, (b) the Lord's Prayer, and (c) the Apostles' Creed or the Nicene Creed as the symbol of the faith and unity of the Holy Catholic Church. He shall also agree that when thereto invited by the Bishop of this Church having jurisdiction in the place where he lives, he will (unless unavoidably prevented) meet with such Bishop for Holy Communion and for counsel and co-operation ; and that he will hold himself answerable to the Bishop of this Church having jurisdiction in the place where he lives, or, if there be no such Bishop, to the Presiding Bishop of this Church, in case he be called in question with respect to error of faith or of conduct.

4. In case a person so ordained be charged with error of faith or of conduct he shall have reasonable notice of the charge and reasonable opportunity to be heard, and the procedure shall be similar to the procedure in the case of a clergyman of this Church charged with the like offence. The sentence shall always be pronounced by the Bishop and shall be such as a Clergyman of this Church would be liable to. It shall be certified to the Ecclesiastical Authority to which the defendant is responsible in any other Communion. If he shall have been tried before a tribunal of the Communion in which he has exercised his ministry, the judgment of such tribunal proceeding in the due exercise of its jurisdiction shall be taken as conclusive evidence of facts thereby adjudged.

5. A Minister so ordained may officiate according to the prescribed order of this Church in a Diocese or Missionary District of this Church when licensed by the Ecclesiastical Authority thereof, but he shall not become the Rector or a Minister of any Parish or Congregation of this Church until he shall have subscribed and made to the Ordinary a declaration in writing, whereby he shall solemnly engage to conform to the Doctrine, Discipline and Worship of this Church. Upon his making such declaration and being duly elected Rector or Minister of a Parish or Congregation of this Church, and complying with the Canons of this Church and of the Diocese or Missionary District in that behalf, he shall become for all purposes a Minister of this Church.

6. In this Canon the action to be taken by a Bishop is limited to that of the Bishop of a Diocese or Missionary District, having jurisdiction therein.

59. *National Council of the Congregational Churches*

Springfield, Massachusetts, October 20, 1923.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENT BY THE COMMISSION ON
COMITY, FEDERATION AND UNITY

[Received by the National Council, and referred to its Commission on Inter-Church relations for further action.]

In addition to its printed report, the Commission on Comity, Federation and Unity has to report that a recent event of much importance has thrown light on the question whether or not the Episcopal Bishops have power to act in any instance according to the agreements of the Concordat.¹ This involves the serious question under what obligations to act the Bishops are laid in accordance with the agreements of the Concordat adopted by the Episcopal Convention. The Canon explicitly and positively states upon what conditions an applicant for additional ordination under the Canon may receive orders. It thus creates a certain right on the one side and a corresponding obligation on the other side.

The particular case which brings this question to a point of decision is as follows : Professor Bainton of the Divinity School of Yale University, with the approval of Dean Brown, asked of the Bishop of Connecticut such ordination. This instance was itself of more than ordinary local significance owing to its relations to the interests of religious education in the universities. The Bishop was unwilling to grant the request. Without reference to any personal or other considerations of which the Bishop must be the judge, the final reason which the Bishop gave for his refusal to grant this application at once renders this case a precedent for all such applications, and consequently it becomes a test case

¹ See pp. 207 f., No. 58 *supra*.

of the value of the Concordat to the ministry of other Churches. For the Bishop stated that the House of Deputies had refused to concur with the House of Bishops in authorizing such changes in the form of ordering Priests as might seem advisable in the special ordinations authorized by the Concordat. Consequently the Bishop decided that he had no power to proceed, for, he said, a 'bishop must act under the law'; hence, so far as this decision is accepted by the Episcopal Church, the offer to us of the Concordat does not hold good.

The Corresponding Secretary of the Commission, Dr. Smyth, then wrote to the Secretaries of the General Convention requesting them to send transcripts of any acts relating to this subject. Their answers made clear that the action of the House of Bishops favouring the Concordat was received by the Deputies on the afternoon of the day before the adjournment of the convention; and, on the next morning, was returned without concurrence to the Bishops just before their adjournment, after their routine business had been finished, and too late for any conference with the other House. Therefore no further action was taken. Consequently, as at present advised, subsequent action is the responsibility of the Episcopal Church.

In recording this apparent failure of the negotiations to find some solution of the problem of ministerial ordination, your Commission desires gratefully to record the progress that has been made towards mutual understanding. The significant fact should not be lost sight of, that the General Convention, both Houses concurring, amended the Constitution of the Episcopal Church so as to make constitutional provision for giving Episcopal ordination to men remaining ministers of other Churches, thus recognizing the validity of the ministry of other Churches. This is a long step in one direction towards the ultimate reunion of the English-speaking Church.

In this connexion, attention is called to

THE LAMBETH APPEAL.

The Appeal of the recent Lambeth Conference to all Christian people has been laid over by previous National Councils to be taken up at this time. It has not, however, as yet been generally presented in any readily accessible form to our Churches, hence few are prepared to give it the thorough consideration which its epochal importance requires. Born as it was of the travail of the war, it has now been sent forth by the Bishops of the whole Anglican Church for all other communions throughout the world to answer. It calls for 'an adventure of goodwill, and still more of faith, for nothing less', they declare, 'is required than a new discovery of the creative resources of God. To this adventure', they say, 'we are convinced that God is now calling all the members of His Church.' When have Congregationalists, since the days when our forefathers went forth from the Church of England, failed to respond to any call for a new adventure of faith? We owe it to the spirit of our whole history to give heed to this bugle call from across these four centuries of separation.

In the year 1910 our National Council at Boston was among the first to respond to an overture for conferences from the previous Lambeth Conference. Since that time our Commission on Comity, Federation and Unity has made frequent reports concerning the progress of such approaches toward unity. The Commission have now received an official copy of the Lambeth Appeal from the Archbishop of Canterbury, together with reports of conferences now going on between Commissions of the Anglican Church and the Free Churches, besides other utterances and documents of importance. We have also received from Lambeth expressions of much interest in any action which this Council may take in respect to it.

In the space allotted to us we cannot present any adequate

account of these proposals, or of the conferences now going on between Commissions of the Anglican Bishops and the Free Churches in England. We may only notice that the Appeal passes by and leaves behind us any question as to the validity of our ministry or the efficiency of our sacraments. The Bishops ask first of themselves and then of all others 'a readiness to make sacrifices for the sake of a common fellowship, a common ministry, and a common service in the world'. In making this Appeal they do not come to us empty handed, nor with an offering of words only. For although, as a Conference only of Bishops, not empowered to legislate, they leap over any constitutional or canonical limitations by the adoption of the following resolution declaring that a 'Bishop is justified in giving occasional authorization to ministers not episcopally ordained, who in his judgement are working towards the ideal of union such as is described in our Appeal, to preach in churches within his Diocese and to clergy of the Diocese to preach in the churches of such ministers'. They go still further, and, in reference to the intercommunion of believers, they declare that 'the Bishops of the Anglican Communion will not question the action of any Bishop who, in the few years between the initiation and completion of a definite scheme of union, shall countenance the irregularity of admitting to communion the baptized but unconfirmed communicants of non-Episcopal congregations concerned in the scheme'.

In view of this situation, thus briefly indicated, your Commission would recommend the adoption of the following resolutions :

First, that this National Council express its thankful appreciation of the spirit and aim of this Appeal of the Lambeth Conference.

Second, that in further preparation for final determination of our action upon it, we would recommend that it be laid before our State and local Associations and Conferences

for further information, and made generally known among the people of our Churches.

Third, that the Commission on Comity, Federation and Unity be asked to make public, through the press or otherwise, any interim statements or utterances from other Christian bodies which they may deem desirable for the further information of the ministry and congregations of our own denomination.

60. The Protestant Episcopal Church and the Czecho-Slovak Orthodox Church in America

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH¹

DECEMBER 13, 1922

[According to the Report of the Anglican and Foreign Church Society published in 1920 (S.P.C.K.), a number of Czech priests of the Roman Catholic Church, whose demands for certain drastic ecclesiastical reforms had been rejected by the Pope, held a meeting at Prague on January 8, 1920 and decided to establish an independent Czech Church. The Reformed Czecho-Slovak Church was accordingly officially recognized by the Czecho-Slovak State on February 29, 1920. Later (see *Church Quarterly Review*, July 1922) negotiations were opened with the Serbian Orthodox Church, with the result that union with that Church was proclaimed in the autumn of 1921. Dr. Pavlik, one of three priests elected by the votes of the parishes to be Bishops in the new Church, was consecrated on September 20, 1921, at Belgrade by the Patriarch of Yugoslavia, assisted by other Serbian Bishops and the Russian Archbishop Antony of Kiev, as the first Bishop of the Czecho-Slovak Church. As a condition of union with the Serbian Church, the Czecho-Slovak Church formally accepted the dogmas of the Eastern Orthodox Church, and the first seven Oecumenical Councils.]

The National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America has received with pleasure

¹ For a statement of recent communications on the part of the American Episcopal Church with the several European Churches

the Memorandum presented by the Right Reverend Gorazd Pavlik, Bishop of the Czecho-Slovak Church, dated December 11, 1922, which Memorandum was read to the Council at the opening of its regular meeting held December 13, 1922, by the President.

The Council has watched with interest the re-establishment of the ancient National Church in Czecho-Slovakia, and notes with gratification the statement in the Memorandum that the Dogmatic Standards of the newly-organized Church, as set forth in the decrees of the Ecclesiastical Mass Meetings held in Prague in the year 1921, have the same foundation as our own, and that the new Bishop was regularly consecrated by the Serbian Orthodox Church, whose Orders we recognize as Apostolic.

Our Church has long been concerned for the spiritual welfare of the Czecho-Slovak people in America, such large numbers of whom have been living and bringing up their children without any religious ministrations. It is with a deep sense of responsibility that we receive this expression of Bishop Gorazd Pavlik of his desire for our Church's co-operation in reaching his unchurched people in America, and we earnestly express our desire to do everything in our power to co-operate in this all-important matter.

Concerning the first of the specific requests of the Czecho-Slovak Bishop, namely, for the mutual fellowship of our respective Churches, we will communicate with our Bishops in the various Dioceses in which communicants of the Czecho-Slovak Orthodox Church live, and urge them to provide the Sacraments and Pastoral Care for them in such places where it may be either difficult or impossible to secure a priest of the Czecho-Slovak Orthodox Church. And also we will advise the Bishops in the various Dioceses

and the Churches of the Near East, see *Report to the National Council on Visit to the Churches of Europe and the Near East* by Rev. W. C. Emhardt (*The Christian East*, August and November 1923).

to give fraternal co-operation and moral support to the parishes of the Czecho-Slovak Orthodox Church which may be established in America. Moreover, we express our desire that the Czecho-Slovak Orthodox Church minister in like manner to communicants of our Church visiting or residing in the Republic of Czecho-Slovakia.

In response to the second¹ specific request of the Czecho-Slovak Bishop, the Council has directed its Department of Missions to keep in vital and intimate touch with the situation, needs and developments of the Czecho-Slovak Orthodox Church, both in Europe and America.

¹ This second request was ' that the Presiding Bishop and Council bring about the creation of a Commission whose function would be to keep in vital intimate touch with the situation, needs, and development of the Czecho-Slovak Orthodox Church both in Europe and America '.

XII. AUSTRALIA

61. *Resolutions adopted by the Reunion Conference between representatives of the Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches in Australia*

HOLDEN AT THE CHAPTER HOUSE, ST. ANDREW'S
CATHEDRAL, SYDNEY, N.S.W., ON MARCH 28-9, 1922

[A full Report of the Discussions and Resolutions of this Conference was published as *Australia and Reunion* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1922).]

I. EPISCOPACY

That, while the right of the Church to determine its own polity at any time is recognized, in the opinion of this Conference, in view of all the circumstances, it is expedient that the polity of the reunited Catholic Church be episcopal, provided that (1) the appointment to the office of a Bishop be shared in by ministry and laity ; (2) that such office be exercised in a representative and constitutional manner, i. e. that in all administrative actions the Bishop should be responsible to the representative assembly, conference, or synod of the Church ; (3) that such acceptance of episcopacy does not necessarily imply that ministerial authority cannot be otherwise obtained, or that episcopacy is the only channel of Divine grace.

2. GROUP LIBERTY

That this Conference welcomes the assurance, implied under clause four of the Lambeth Appeal, that each group within the reunited Church would be free to retain its characteristic method of worship and service, in so far as such retention is not inconsistent with the fellowship of the whole.

3. ORDINATION

That this Conference recommends that the conditions for the mutual recognition of Episcopal and non-Episcopal orders and commissions be thoroughly explored by the respective Churches, and to this end recommends the appointment of a Committee by this Conference for the purpose of receiving reports from such Churches, and ascertaining the possibilities of arriving at a common mind, and reporting to a further Conference suggestions as to details or formulae of any such Commission or Commissions. Further, that the committee consist of the Bishop of Willochra (Convener), the Secretaries of the Conference, and two representatives from each Church, making a total of eleven in all.

4. CO-OPERATION

That an interim Joint Committee be appointed (1) to make arrangements for any future Conference on Reunion ; (2) to prepare a draft of a statement of agreement on matters of faith and order ; (3) to consider and recommend definite schemes of co-operation.

5. BISHOP OF WILLOCHRA'S MEMORANDUM

That the Memorandum presented by the Bishop of Willochra be referred to the Interim Joint Committee for consideration.

6. THE CREED

That, while conditions of membership in the reunited Church might be satisfied by the Apostles' Creed or some shorter or simpler form of personal confession of the Christian faith, a corporate creed would be necessary as a common standard precedent to union, and for this purpose the Nicene Creed would be a most appropriate and acceptable form.

Resolutions of the First Reunion Conference 219

7. UNION BETWEEN PRESBYTERIAN, METHODIST AND CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES

That this Conference desires to take the opportunity of expressing its sympathy with the movement for the union of the Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational Churches, and its hope that the movement will not be delayed, in view of the prospect of any wider movement, since any union effected between two or more Churches would simplify and facilitate the problem of the wider unity contemplated by this Conference.

62. Some Proposals on Preliminary Action Towards Closer Fellowship

MEMORANDUM BY THE BISHOP OF WILLOCHRA

(Approved by the General Synod Reunion Committee
March 24, 1922)

AS AMENDED BY THE JOINT COMMITTEE APPOINTED
BY THE REUNION CONFERENCE

1. A statement of agreement on points of Faith and Order shall be drawn up, and the Churches already negotiating for union with each other, i.e. the Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational Churches together with the Anglican Church, shall take the name of 'Churches Contemplating Reunion'.

2. A Central Office and Registry shall be established for Australia, and supported by private contributions from all the 'Churches Contemplating Reunion'.

3. A complete record shall be kept of all communications and agreements between the 'Churches Contemplating Reunion' and a list of all recognized ministers of the respective Churches and of their record and qualifications.

4. The Conference shall appoint a Treasurer to receive contributions for expenses connected with the promotion of Reunion.

5. There shall be a common Australian Council and State Councils, which shall meet from time to time, and shall consult on matters of common interest, e. g. :

- I. United Prayer.
2. Conferences on Subjects connected with Reunion.
3. Religious Education.
4. Theological Faculties.
5. Christian Missions.
6. United Evangelistic Work.
7. Social and Economic Questions.
8. Public Morality.
9. Lectures and Literature in Defence of Christianity.
10. The Study of Christian Institutions and matters of Faith and Order by Ministers in common.
- II. Plans for Closer Union.

6. The Australian Council on Reunion shall for the present consist of thirty-six members appointed by the 'Churches Contemplating Reunion', of whom eighteen shall represent the Anglican Church, and six each the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches, and shall have power to appoint Committees on the above subjects, and to administer such funds as may be entrusted to it. The State Councils shall consist of thirty-six members in the same proportion appointed by the respective Churches.

63. *Second Reunion Conference, Cronulla* *May 1-3, 1923*

IN accordance with the arrangement made at the Reunion Conference at the Chapter House, St. Andrew's Cathedral, Sydney, in March 1922, a further conference was held at Cronulla, N.S. Wales, beginning on May 1 and concluding on May 3, 1923.

For the purpose of closer fellowship, the representatives boarded together at 'Mundadoo', Cronulla Beach, during the period of the conference.

The following were the representatives of the several Churches :

ANGLICAN : The Archbishop of Sydney, Bishop of Goulburn, Bishop of Willochra, Bishop of Grafton, Archdeacon Davies, Canon Hughes, Canon Batty, Rev. P. A. Micklem, Rev. G. A. Chambers, Rev. James Norman, Hon. Lyttleton Groom, M.H.R., Mr. C. R. Walsh.

PRESBYTERIAN : Rev. Drs. Harper, Burgess, Angus, Macintyre, O.B.E., Seymour, Revs. I. Bertram, D. Cameron, W. H. Gray.

METHODIST : Revs. Dr. Carruthers, Dr. Prescott, E. Dyer, W. H. Howard, T. B. Holmes, P. J. Stephen, W. E. Bennett, Mr. H. M. Hawkins.

CONGREGATIONAL : Revs. W. L. Patison, Principal Griffith, F. V. Pratt, George Rayner, A. P. Campbell, J. E. James, W. J. Ashford, Ernest Davies.

His Grace the Archbishop of Sydney was elected to the chair ; the Revs. P. A. Micklem and A. P. Campbell were appointed secretaries ; and the Revs. C. N. Button and G. A. Chambers recorders.

The subjects dealt with were :

I. THE NATURE OF THE CHURCH IN ITS BEARING UPON UNITY

II. ORDINATION AND THE MINISTRY

III. POSSIBILITIES OF PRELIMINARY ACTION TOWARDS CLOSER FELLOWSHIP

After discussion of each topic the following statements were agreed to :

I. THE NATURE OF THE CHURCH

1. The foundation of the Church rests not upon the will or consent or beliefs of men, whether as individuals or as societies, but upon the creative Will of God.

2. The Church is the Body of Christ, and its constitutive principle is Christ Himself, living in His members through His Spirit.

3. As there is but one Christ, and one life in Him, so there is and can be but one Church.

4. This one Church consists of all those who have been, or are being, redeemed by and in Christ, whether they are in this world or in the world beyond our sight, but it has its expression in this world in a visible form. Yet the Church, as invisible and as visible, is, by virtue of its one life in Christ, one.

5. This visible Church was instituted by Christ as a fellowship of men united with Him, and in Him with one another, to be His witness and His instrument in the spread of His Kingdom on earth.

6. As a visible Church, it must possess certain visible and recognizable marks whereby it can be seen and known by men. These have been since the days of the Apostles at least the following : (a) The profession of faith in God as revealed and incarnate in Christ ; (b) the observance of the two sacraments ordained by Christ Himself ; (c) an ideal

of the Christian life protected by a common discipline ;
(d) a ministry, representative of the Church, for the preaching of the Word, the administration of the Sacrament, and the maintenance of the unity and continuity of the Church's witness and work.

7. Baptism is, by the ordinance of Christ and of His Apostles, the outward and visible sign of admission into membership of the Church.

8. The Church visible on earth ought to express and manifest to the world by its own visible unity the one Life in Christ of the one Body.

9. The true relation of the Church and local Churches is that which is described in the New Testament, namely, that the Churches are the local representatives of the one Church. The actual situation brought about in the course of history in which there are different and even rival denominational Churches independent of each other and existing together in the same locality, whatever justification arising out of historical circumstances may be claimed for these temporary separations, cannot be regarded as in accordance with the purpose of Christ, and every endeavour ought to be made to restore the true position as set forth in the New Testament.

10. The marks which ought to characterize the Church visible on earth are possessed by these existing separate Churches and societies of Christian people in very varying degrees of completeness or defect. Hence, even though they be parts of the visible Church, they cannot be considered as all alike giving equally adequate expression to the Lord's Mind and Purpose. Some, indeed, may be so defective that they cannot rightly be judged to be parts of that Church. But such judgements, though made in trust that they are in accordance with the Divine Mind, must be regarded as limited to the sphere of the visible Church as an ordered society here on earth. It would be presumption to claim

that they have a like validity in the sphere of the whole Church as the One Body of the Redeemed in Christ, for within that sphere judgement can only be given by the All-knowing Mind and Sovereign Mercy of God.

[The above Report was taken clause by clause from the 'Report of a Joint Conference held at Lambeth in May 1922', attended by representatives of the Church of England and the Free Churches, issued under the signatures of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the Rev. J. D. Jones, Moderator of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches.¹]

It was also resolved to add the following proviso as taken from the preface of the above Report :

'It will be understood that the propositions which the Report contains are not intended as a complete statement of the great subjects with which they deal : nor even as expressing what individual members of the Conference or the Churches which they represent might regard as a full statement of their own positions. They are submitted simply as expressing substantially the very large measure of agreement which, after full and frank discussion, the Conference has been enabled to reach.'

II. ORDERS AND THE MINISTRY

1. Unity is consistent with a very considerable amount of variety of Order in the Re-united Church, so long as these varieties are not inconsistent with the fellowship of the whole.

2. We believe that it is necessary that there should be a common Ministry universally recognized.

3. We consider that the Ministry should consist of at least the following orders or kinds : Deacons, Presbyters, and Bishops.

4. It is necessary to observe certain conditions precedent to Ordination, and to have a particular manner of Ordination.

¹ See pp. 143 f., No. 44 *supra*.

5. The conditions to be required precedent to Ordination ought, in our opinion, to be :

- (1) Evidence of a true vocation to the Ministry.
- (2) Acceptance by the Church for the work of the Ministry.
- (3) An acknowledgement that the Ministry of the individual is subordinate to the authority of the Church as a whole.

The manner of ordination to be required should be as follows :

The Episcopate in association with the Presbyterate should be accepted for the United Church of the future as the means whereby the authority of the whole Body is given to the Ministry of the Church. At the same time the Council of the Presbyters and the Congregation of the Faithful should be maintained as permanent elements in Ordination, as in other parts of the order and life of the United Church.

At the instance of the non-Episcopal representatives the following resolution was adopted :

That this Conference desires it to be recorded that the members of the Conference belonging to the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches, while earnestly desiring and seeking the larger reunion, respectfully intimate to the representatives of the Anglican Church that in entering into the Reunited Church they cannot see their way to accept any commission which, in the form of the rite, implies or may be taken to imply for either party an act of ordination.

III. POSSIBILITIES OF CLOSER FELLOWSHIP

The Conference agreed to answers to a series of questions that had been drawn up, the effect of these being as follows :
' We believe that it is both desirable and possible that the Anglican Church and the Churches already negotiating for

union (Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational) should take preliminary action towards closer fellowship. We believe that as a preliminary to such action a statement of agreement on points of faith and order can and should be drawn up. The name to be adopted for the Churches taking such action should be "Churches Contemplating Reunion". We believe that it is desirable that a central registry be established for Australia, and supported by *pro rata* contributions from all the "Churches Contemplating Reunion". A complete record should be kept of all communications and agreements between the "Churches Contemplating Reunion", and a list of all recognized ministers of the respective Churches. A treasurer should be appointed to receive contributions for expenses connected with the promotion of reunion. It is desirable that there should be a common Australian Council and State Councils which should meet from time to time to consult. Such Councils should consult on the following matters: United prayer, conferences on subjects connected with reunion, religious education, theological faculties, Christian missions, social and economic questions, public morality, lectures and literature in defence of Christianity, the study in common of Christian institutions and matters of faith and order; also plans for closer union, and the question of united evangelistic work. Such Councils shall for the present be appointed by the heads of the Churches in whatever way these respective Churches may decide. The number of representatives of the Churches on the Councils shall be eighteen for the Church of England and six for each of the other Churches concerned.'

FURTHER ACTION

The Interim Joint Committee was reappointed, with power to call a further Conference together when considered desirable, and to deal with any matters that might arise in the meantime, viz.: The Bishop of Willochra,

Archdeacon Davies, Canon Hughes, the Rev. Drs. Macintyre, Angus, Carruthers, Prescott, the Rev. George Rayner, the Rev. F. V. Pratt, with the Revs. P. A. Micklem and A. P. Campbell as joint-secretaries.

It was resolved that a further Conference on Reunion be held not later than twelve months hence. Also, that the heads of the Churches should be asked to arrange for the observance of an annual Sunday of Prayer for Reunion.

The devotional services of the Conference were held in the local Anglican church, and the deliberative sessions in the Methodist church. To the clergy and officers of these churches the thanks of the Conference were cordially tendered.

64. The Methodist Church of Australasia

RESOLUTIONS ON THE LAMBETH APPEAL

Adopted by the Seventh General Conference, May 1923

We, Ministers and Laymen of the Methodist Church of Australasia, assembled in General Conference in Adelaide, South Australia, desire cordially to acknowledge the 'Appeal to All Christian People' issued by the Lambeth Conference of Anglican Bishops. We gratefully recognize the gracious spirit of that Appeal, and declare our readiness to co-operate in mutual efforts to effect the realization of the purpose aimed at in that historic document, welcoming with all our hearts the token thus given of an earnest desire to draw all Christian people more closely together.

We desire to identify ourselves with the declaration of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference of Great Britain¹ in reference to the important matters contained in the Lambeth Appeal, and declare :

- I. We reverently accept the Holy Scriptures interpreted from age to age by the spirit of truth as a record of

¹ See No. 36 *supra*.

Divine revelation and the supreme rule of faith and conduct.

2. We acknowledge the Apostles' Creed as a very early baptismal confession of belief, and the Creed commonly called Nicene as a statement of Christian faith upon certain fundamental truths, and while claiming reasonable liberty of interpretation, we heartily accept the substance of the teaching contained in both these venerable symbols.

3. We believe the two Sacraments were instituted for the Church by Christ Himself, namely, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and that while there may be differences of opinion concerning them as signs and seals of Divine grace, they have been Divinely appointed for the expression of the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ.'

We also accept the assurance that the suggestions in the Appeal are not intended to imply, on the part of any one, a repudiation of his spiritual ancestry or of past experience of spiritual blessing; that no absorption of any one communion by another is contemplated, but rather ' the preservation of various treasures of faith and order possessed in common and made serviceable to the whole Body of Christ '.

We desire, also, to state our conviction that neither in our Lord's own teaching nor in any part of the New Testament is one form of Church polity prescribed as essential to the Church, and that no one order of ministry can claim the direct commission of Christ or of His Apostles as giving to it an authority to which no other is entitled. While gladly recognizing the value of the Episcopacy, the question as to whether it is the one indispensable means of providing a ministry universally acceptable, needs careful investigation.

We desire also to state that we cannot see our way to accept any form of recommission that may seem to imply,

or be construed into an act of, ordination of those who are already validly ordained to the Ministry of the Christian Church.

We welcome the proposal to establish a Council of Representatives of the Churches to deal unitedly with matters common to the whole Church, and are willing cordially to co-operate in giving practical effect thereto.

ADDITIONAL NOTE

ON PROPOSED UNION BETWEEN THE PRESBYTERIAN, METHODIST, AND CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES OF AUSTRALIA

After many years of consultation and conference a 'Basis of Union', including Doctrine and Polity, was agreed to at a Joint Conference of the Committees on Union, appointed by the Supreme Courts of the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches of Australia, held at Melbourne from September 3 to 6, 1918.

It was published 'as finally revised by the Joint Committee of the three Churches September 21-23, 1921,' under the title 'Proposed Basis of Union for the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches of Australia. Doctrine and Polity' (Brown, Prior & Co., Melbourne). The name of the Church to be formed by this union is given in the opening paragraph as 'The United Church of Australia'. The proposed basis has been described as 'very similar' to the Basis of Union already agreed upon by the corresponding Churches in Canada (see *Australia and Reunion*, page 144: Angus & Robertson Ltd., Sydney, 1922), but a good many questions relating to law, property, and finance still stand over, and definite proposals on these important matters are awaited with interest.

In September 1920 a vote was taken by ballot on the Basis of Union as agreed in September 1918. The result of this vote was as follows :

- (a) In the Presbyterian Church of Australia, out of the total number of 73,430 members on the Roll 73,371 exercised the right to vote ; and of these 43,638 were in favour of union and 29,733 were opposed.
- (b) In the Methodist Church of Australasia, out of the total number entitled to vote (100,634 members and 14,375 trustees) 64 per cent. of the Church members and 66 per cent. of the trustees exercised their right. Of those who thus voted 88 per cent. of the members and 86 per cent. of the trustees were in favour of union.
- (c) In the Congregational Churches, 9,046 members voted for union and 1,795 against. This voting is stated to represent 57 per cent. of the nominal membership and from 70 to 80 per cent., possibly, of the effective membership.

In May 1923 the General Conference of the Methodist Church again adopted Resolutions in favour of union. The Presbyterian General Assembly is to consider its position again in 1924, when the result of a second vote it proposed to take in 1923 has been made known (see *Minutes of the Seventh General Conference of the Methodist Church of Australasia*, pages 84-5, 184-6. Gillingham, Swann & Co., Adelaide).

XIII. CANADA

65. *The United Church of Canada*

THE BASIS OF UNION AS PREPARED BY THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE PRESBYTERIAN, METHODIST, AND CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES IN CANADA, AND APPROVED BY THE SUPREME COURTS OF THESE CHURCHES, JANUARY 1924

[The Basis of Union, as agreed upon by the Joint Committee on Church Union representing the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches in Canada, has been finally accepted by the representative assemblies of those Churches themselves, after conferences and negotiations lasting over twenty years. Resolutions to adopt the Basis and to take the necessary legal steps to consummate the Union were carried (1) by the General Conference of the Methodist Church of Canada in October 1922 (unanimously), (2) by the Annual Gathering of the Congregational Union of Canada in June 1923 (by 54 votes to 3), and (3) by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada in June 1923 (by 427 votes to 129). Further, the General Council of Local Union Churches (a movement mainly belonging to Western Canada) has given its assurance that 'the Local Union Churches are ready to merge into the United Church of Canada as soon as the contemplated Union is effected'.

As is explained in the 'Appendix on Law', 'in order to give legal consummation to the Union it is necessary that the United Church should be incorporated by a special Act of the Parliament of Canada, while special Acts of the legislatures of the several Provinces of the Dominion and Newfoundland and the Bermudas and any other country in which the negotiating Churches hold property should also be obtained'.]

GENERAL

1. The name of the Church formed by the union of the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches in Canada, shall be 'The United Church of Canada'.

2. It shall be the policy of The United Church to foster the spirit of unity in the hope that this sentiment of unity may in due time, so far as Canada is concerned, take shape in a Church which may fittingly be described as national.

DOCTRINE

We, the representatives of the Presbyterian, the Methodist, and the Congregational branches of the Church of Christ in Canada, do hereby set forth the substance of the Christian faith, as commonly held among us. In doing so, we build upon the foundation laid by the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone. We affirm our belief in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the primary source and ultimate standard of Christian faith and life. We acknowledge the teaching of the great creeds of the ancient Church. We further maintain our allegiance to the evangelical doctrines of the Reformation, as set forth in common in the doctrinal standards adopted by the Presbyterian Church in Canada, by the Congregational Union of Ontario and Quebec, and by the Methodist Church. We present the accompanying statement as a brief summary of our common faith and commend it to the studious attention of the members and adherents of the negotiating Churches, as in substance agreeable to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures.

ARTICLE I. *Of God.* We believe in the one only living and true God, a Spirit, infinite, eternal and unchangeable, in His being and perfections; the Lord Almighty, who is love, most just in all His ways, most glorious in holiness, unsearchable in wisdom, plenteous in mercy, full of compassion, and abundant in goodness and truth. We worship Him in the unity of the Godhead and the mystery of the Holy Trinity, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, three persons of the same substance, equal in power and glory.

ARTICLE II. *Of Revelation.* We believe that God has revealed Himself in nature, in history, and in the heart of man; that He has been graciously pleased to make clearer revelation of Himself to men of God who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit; and that in the fullness of time

He has perfectly revealed Himself in Jesus Christ, the Word made flesh, who is the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of His person. We receive the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, given by inspiration of God, as containing the only infallible rule of faith and life, a faithful record of God's gracious revelations, and as the sure witness to Christ.

ARTICLE III. *Of the Divine Purpose.* We believe that the eternal, wise, holy and loving purpose of God so embraces all events that while the freedom of man is not taken away, nor is God the author of sin, yet in His providence He makes all things work together in the fulfilment of His sovereign design and the manifestation of His glory.

ARTICLE IV. *Of Creation and Providence.* We believe that God is the creator, upholder and governor of all things ; that He is above all His works and in them all ; and that He made man in His own image, meet for fellowship with Him, free and able to choose between good and evil, and responsible to his Maker and Lord.

ARTICLE V.—*Of the Sin of Man.* We believe that our first parents, being tempted, chose evil, and so fell away from God and came under the power of sin, the penalty of which is eternal death ; and that, by reason of this disobedience, all men are born with a sinful nature, that we have broken God's law and that no man can be saved but by His grace.

ARTICLE VI.—*Of the Grace of God.* We believe that God, out of His great love for the world, has given His only-begotten Son to be the Saviour of sinners, and in the Gospel freely offers His all-sufficient salvation to all men. We believe also that God, in His own good pleasure, gave to His Son a people, an innumerable multitude, chosen in Christ unto holiness, service and salvation.

ARTICLE VII.—*Of the Lord Jesus Christ.* We believe in and confess the Lord Jesus Christ, the only Mediator between

God and man, who, being the Eternal Son of God, for us men and for our salvation became truly man, being conceived of the Holy Spirit and born of the Virgin Mary, yet without sin. Unto us He has revealed the Father, by His word and Spirit, making known the perfect will of God. For our redemption He fulfilled all righteousness, offered Himself a perfect sacrifice on the cross, satisfied Divine Justice and made propitiation for the sins of the whole world. He rose from the dead and ascended into Heaven, where He ever intercedes for us. In the hearts of believers He abides for ever as the indwelling Christ; above us and over us all He rules; wherefore, unto Him we render love, obedience and adoration as our Prophet, Priest and King.

ARTICLE VIII.—*Of the Holy Spirit.* We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceeds from the Father and the Son, who moves upon the hearts of men to restrain them from evil and to incite them unto good, and whom the Father is ever willing to give unto all who ask Him. We believe that He has spoken by holy men of God in making known His truth to men for their salvation; that, through our exalted Saviour, He was sent forth in power to convict the world of sin, to enlighten men's minds in the knowledge of Christ, and to persuade and enable them to obey the call of the Gospel; and that He abides with the Church, dwelling in every believer as the Spirit of truth, of power, of holiness, of comfort and of love.

ARTICLE IX.—*Of Regeneration.* We believe in the necessity of regeneration, whereby we are made new creatures in Christ Jesus by the Spirit of God, who imparts spiritual life by the gracious and mysterious operation of His power, using as the ordinary means the truths of His word and the ordinances of divine appointment in ways agreeable to the nature of man.

ARTICLE X.—*Of Faith and Repentance.* We believe that faith in Christ is a saving grace whereby we receive Him,

trust in Him, and rest upon Him alone for salvation as He is offered to us in the Gospel, and that this saving faith is always accompanied by repentance, wherein we confess and forsake our sins with full purpose of and endeavour after a new obedience to God.

ARTICLE XI.—*Of Justification and Sonship.* We believe that God, on the sole ground of the perfect obedience and sacrifice of Christ, pardons those who by faith receive Him as their Saviour and Lord, accepts them as righteous and bestows upon them the adoption of sons, with a right to all the privileges therein implied, including a conscious assurance of their sonship.

ARTICLE XII.—*Of Sanctification.* We believe that those who are regenerated and justified grow in the likeness of Christ through fellowship with Him, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and obedience to the truth ; that a holy life is the fruit and evidence of saving faith ; and that the believer's hope of continuance in such a life is in the preserving grace of God. And we believe that in this growth in grace Christians may attain that maturity and full assurance of faith whereby the love of God is made perfect in us.

ARTICLE XIII.—*Of Prayer.* We believe that we are encouraged to draw near to God, our Heavenly Father, in the name of His Son, Jesus Christ, and on our own behalf and that of others to pour out our hearts humbly yet freely before Him, as becomes His beloved children, giving Him the honour and praise due His holy name, asking Him to glorify Himself on earth as in heaven, confessing unto Him our sins and seeking of Him every gift needful for this life and for our everlasting salvation. We believe also that, inasmuch as all true prayer is prompted by His Spirit, He will in response thereto grant us every blessing according to His unsearchable wisdom and the riches of His grace in Jesus Christ.

ARTICLE XIV.—*Of the Law of God.* We believe that the

moral law of God, summarized in the Ten Commandments, testified to by the prophets and unfolded in the life and teachings of Jesus Christ, stands for ever in truth and equity, and is not made void by faith, but on the contrary is established thereby. We believe that God requires of every man to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with God ; and that only through this harmony with the will of God shall be fulfilled that brotherhood of man wherein the kingdom of God is to be made manifest.

ARTICLE XV.—*Of the Church.* We acknowledge one holy Catholic Church, the innumerable company of saints of every age and nation, who being united by the Holy Spirit to Christ their Head are one body in Him and have communion with their Lord and with one another. Further, we receive it as the will of Christ that His Church on earth should exist as a visible and sacred brotherhood, consisting of those who profess faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to Him, together with their children, and other baptized children, and organized for the confession of His name, for the public worship of God, for the administration of the sacraments, for the upbuilding of the saints, and for the universal propagation of the Gospel ; and we acknowledge as a part, more or less pure, of this universal brotherhood, every particular Church throughout the world which professes this faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to Him as divine Lord and Saviour.

ARTICLE XVI.—*Of the Sacraments.* We acknowledge two sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, which were instituted by Christ, to be of perpetual obligation as signs and seals of the covenant ratified in His precious blood, as means of grace, by which, working in us, He doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and comfort our faith in Him, and as ordinances through the observance of which His Church is to confess her Lord and be visibly distinguished from the rest of the world.

1. *Baptism with water into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit* is the sacrament by which are signified and sealed our union to Christ and participation in the blessings of the new covenant. The proper subjects of baptism are believers, and infants presented by their parents or guardians in the Christian faith. In the latter case the parents or guardians should train up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and should expect that their children will, by the operation of the Holy Spirit, receive the benefits which the sacrament is designed and fitted to convey. The Church is under the most solemn obligation to provide for their Christian instruction.

2. *The Lord's Supper* is the sacrament of communion with Christ and with His people, in which bread and wine are given and received in thankful remembrance of Him and His sacrifice on the cross ; and they who in faith receive the same do, after a spiritual manner, partake of the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ to their comfort, nourishment and growth in grace. All may be admitted to the Lord's Supper who make a credible profession of their faith in the Lord Jesus Christ and of obedience to His law.

ARTICLE XVII.—*Of the Ministry.* We believe that Jesus Christ, as the Supreme Head of the Church, has appointed therein a ministry of the word and sacraments, and calls men to this ministry ; that the Church, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, recognizes and chooses those whom He calls, and should thereupon duly ordain them to the work of the ministry.

ARTICLE XVIII.—*Of Church Order and Fellowship.* We believe that the Supreme and only Head of the Church is the Lord Jesus Christ ; that its worship, teaching, discipline, and government should be administered according to His will by persons chosen for their fitness and duly set apart to their office ; and that although the visible Church may

contain unworthy members and is liable to err, yet believers ought not lightly to separate themselves from its communion, but are to live in fellowship with their brethren, which fellowship is to be extended, as God gives opportunity, to all who in every place call upon the name of the Lord Jesus.

ARTICLE XIX.—*Of the Resurrection, the Last Judgement, and the Future Life.* We believe that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust, through the power of the Son of God, who shall come to judge the living and the dead ; that the finally impenitent shall go away into eternal punishment and the righteous into life eternal.

ARTICLE XX.—*Of Christian Service and the Final Triumph.* We believe that it is our duty as disciples and servants of Christ, to further the extension of His kingdom, to do good unto all men, to maintain the public and private worship of God, to hallow the Lord's Day, to preserve the inviolability of marriage and the sanctity of the family, to uphold the just authority of the State, and so to live in all honesty, purity, and charity that our lives shall testify of Christ. We joyfully receive the word of Christ, bidding His people go into all the world and make disciples of all nations, declaring unto them that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, and that He will have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth. We confidently believe that by His power and grace all His enemies shall finally be overcome, and the kingdoms of this world be made the kingdom of our God and of His Christ.

POLITY

The Joint Committee, after an examination of the forms of church government of the negotiating Churches and the practical working thereof, is greatly gratified to find :

- I. That while the officers and courts of the negotiating

Churches may bear different names, there is a substantial degree of similarity in the duties and functions of these officers and courts.

2. That, engaged in the same work, with the same object in view, and earnestly endeavouring to meet the conditions confronting the Churches in Canada, the negotiating Churches have been steadily approximating more nearly to each other, both in forms of church government and methods of administration.

3. That there are distinctive elements in each which would add to the efficiency of a united Church, and which can be preserved with great advantage in the form of polity to be adopted for The United Church.

4. That in this view it is possible to provide for substantial local freedom, and at the same time secure the benefits of a strong connexional tie and co-operative efficiency.

The following recommendations are submitted as setting forth the Polity proposed for The United Church of Canada.

I. THE CHURCH

1. The members of The United Church shall be the members of the negotiating Churches, and such others as may hereafter become members.

2. The unit of organization for The United Church shall be the Pastoral Charge. A pastoral charge may consist of more than one local church ; a local church is a body of persons meeting for public worship in one place.

3. The governing bodies or courts of the Church, higher than those of the pastoral charge, shall be :

(a) The Presbytery.

(b) The Conference.

(c) The General Council.

II. THE PASTORAL CHARGE (CIRCUIT OR CONGREGATION)

A.—*Charges existing previous to the Union*

4. In the management of their local affairs the various churches, charges, circuits, or congregations of the negotiating Churches shall be entitled to continue the organization and practices (including those practices relating to membership, church ordinances, Sunday schools and Young People's Societies) enjoyed by them at the time of the union, subject in general affairs to the legislation, principles, and discipline of The United Church. Their representatives in the next higher governing body or court shall be chosen as at present.

5. The plan of organization prescribed for pastoral charges to be formed subsequent to the union may at any time be adopted by any church, charge, circuit, or congregation existing at the time of the union.

6. Subject to the provisions of the next succeeding paragraph hereof, all property, real and personal, under the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada held in trust for or to the use of a church, charge, circuit, or congregation of any of the negotiating Churches, shall be held by trustees appointed by or on behalf of such church, charge, circuit, or congregation, upon trusts set forth and declared in a Model Trust Deed. This Model Trust Deed should be a schedule to the Act, and should contain, among others, a provision to the following effect: That the property is held for the church, charge, circuit, or congregation as a part of The United Church, and that no property so held shall be sold, exchanged, or in any manner encumbered, unless the Presbytery shall, at the instance of the church, charge, circuit, or congregation, have given its sanction, subject to an appeal, if desired, to the Conference.

7. Any property or funds owned by a church, charge, circuit, or congregation at the time of the union solely for

its own benefit, or vested in trustees for the sole benefit of such church, charge, circuit, or congregation, and not for the denomination of which the said church, charge, circuit, or congregation formed a part, shall not be affected by the legislation giving effect to the union or by any legislation of The United Church without the consent of the church, charge, circuit, or congregation for which such property is held in trust.

8. Churches, charges, circuits, or congregations received, subsequent to the union, into The United Church, with the approval of Presbyteries, shall be entitled, if they so desire, to the privileges of sections 4, 5 and 7.

B.—Charges to be formed subsequent to the Union

9. The liberty of the pastoral charge shall be recognized to the fullest extent compatible with :

(a) The oversight of the spiritual interests of the charge by the minister (or ministers) and a body of men specially chosen and set apart or ordained for that work, who shall jointly constitute the session ;

(b) The efficient co-operation of the representatives of the various departments of the work of the charge by means of a meeting to be held at least quarterly ;

(c) The hearty co-operation of the various pastoral charges in the general work of the Church, and

(d) The exercise by the higher governing bodies or courts of their powers and functions, hereinafter set forth.

10. New pastoral charges or local churches shall be formed with the consent of a Presbytery by persons residing within its bounds, who declare their adherence to the principles of The United Church, and their desire for the formation of such charge or church. Missions may be organized as pastoral charges by Presbytery of its own motion, or on the suggestion of the Missionary Superintendent or the Minister, under such regulations as the General Council may pass.

Before sanctioning the formation of a pastoral charge or local church, the Presbytery shall be required to hear and consider the representations of any pastoral charge that may be affected by the proposed action.

11. (a) The members of the Church entitled to all church privileges are those who, on a profession of their faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to Him, have been received into full membership. The children of such persons and all baptized children are members of the Church, and it is their duty and privilege, when they reach the age of discretion, to enter into full membership. Admission to full membership, and granting of certificates of removal, shall be by the action of the session, and by the action of those in full membership where desired by the pastoral charge.

(b) The members of a local church who are entitled to vote at all meetings are persons in full membership, whose names are on the roll of the church. With the consent of these, adherents who contribute regularly to the support of the church may vote on temporal matters.

12. The members of a local church shall meet annually, and more frequently if they deem it advisable.

13. The Session shall have oversight of the spiritual interests of the pastoral charge. The management of its temporal and financial affairs shall be entrusted to a Committee of Stewards. The Official Board, consisting of the Session and Committee of Stewards, with representatives in full church membership of such other departments of church work as may be agreed upon by the General Council, shall meet quarterly, and more frequently if they deem it advisable, for the consideration of matters of joint interest.

14. The members of the session, other than the minister, shall be chosen by those in full church membership, and shall hold office under regulations to be passed by the General Council.

15. (a) It shall be the duty of the session to have the oversight of :

(1) The admission of persons into full membership, and the granting of certificates of removal.

(2) The conduct of members, with power to exercise discipline.

(3) The administration of the sacraments.

(4) The religious training of the young, and the organization of meetings for Christian fellowship, instruction, and work.

(5) The order of public worship, including the service of praise and the use of the church edifice.

(6) The care of the poor, and the visiting of the sick.

(b) It shall also be its duty :

(7) To receive and judge petitions, &c., from members.

(8) To transmit petitions, appeals, &c., to Presbytery.

(9) To recommend suitable laymen to Presbyteries for licence to preach.

(10) To recommend suitable candidates for the ministry.

16. The stewards shall be chosen by the local church, and, wherever practicable, should be persons in full membership.

It shall be the duty of the Committee of Stewards to secure contributions for the purposes of the local church, and to disburse the moneys received for these purposes.

17. It shall be the duty of the Official Board :

(1) To secure contributions for missionary and other general objects of the Church.

(2) To select representatives, in full church membership, of the pastoral charge to the Presbytery.

(3) To submit to the pastoral charge or local church for its consideration reports on life and work, including a full statement of receipts and expenditures, of indebtedness and of estimates for the ensuing year.

(4) To transmit from the pastoral charge, through the

Presbytery, to the Settlement Committee, representations concerning the pastoral relation.

(5) To attend to matters affecting the pastoral charge not assigned to any of the other bodies.

18. All lands, premises, and property acquired for the use of a local church or a pastoral charge of The United Church, shall be held, used, and administered under the trusts of the above Model Trust Deed. (See 'Polity,' par. 6).

III. THE PRESBYTERY

19. The Presbytery shall consist of :

(1) The ordained ministers within the bounds—

(a) Who are engaged in some department of church work ;
and

(b) Who have been placed on the roll by special enactment of the Conference in accordance with regulations to be made by the General Council.

(The rights to membership in Presbyteries, District Meetings, and Associations, enjoyed by ministers at the time of the union, shall be conserved.)

(2) The elders, deacons, leaders or other non-ministerial representatives of pastoral charges, within the bounds, equal in number to the number of ministers, and chosen in accordance with regulations to be made by the General Council.

20. It shall be the duty of the Presbytery :

(1) To have the oversight of the pastoral charges within its bounds, review their records, and form new pastoral charges, or local churches.

(2) To receive and dispose of petitions and appeals from the lower governing bodies or courts.

(3) To transmit petitions and appeals to the higher governing bodies or courts.

(4) To license as preachers laymen who are duly recommended and who after examination are approved.

(5) To superintend the education of students looking forward to the ministry, and to certify them to theological colleges.

(6) To inquire, each year, into the personal character, doctrinal beliefs and general fitness of candidates for the ministry, recommended by sessions, official boards, or local churches; and, when they have fulfilled the prescribed requirements, to license them to preach and to recommend them for the ordination of the Conference.

(7) To induct or install ministers.

(8) To deal with matters sent down by the higher governing bodies or courts.

(9) To adopt measures for promoting the religious life of the pastoral charges within its bounds.

(10) To select non-ministerial representatives to the Conference, of whom at least a majority shall have been previously chosen by pastoral charges to represent them in Presbyteries, and to nominate representatives on the Conference Settlement Committee.

(11) To have the oversight of the conduct of ministers within its bounds.

IV. THE CONFERENCE

21. The Conference shall consist of the ministers on the rolls of the Presbyteries within its bounds, and an equal number of non-ministerial representatives of pastoral charges chosen as provided for in subsection 20 (par. 10).

22. It shall be the duty of the Conference :

(1) To meet every year.

(2) To determine the number and boundaries of the Presbyteries within its bounds, have oversight of them, and review their records.

(3) To receive and dispose of appeals and petitions, subject to the usual right of appeal.

(4) To see that, as far as possible, every pastoral charge

within its bounds shall have a pastorate without interruption, and that every effective minister shall have a pastoral charge, and to effect this through a Settlement Committee which it shall appoint annually.

(5) To examine and ordain candidates for the ministry who have fulfilled the prescribed requirements and have been recommended by Presbyteries.

(6) To receive ministers from other Churches subject to the regulations of the General Council.

(7) To deal with matters referred to it by the General Council.

(8) To select an equal number of ministerial and non-ministerial representatives to the General Council.

(9) To have oversight of the religious life of the Church within its bounds, and to adopt such measures as may be judged necessary for its promotion.

V. THE GENERAL COUNCIL

23. The General Council shall consist of an equal number of ministers and non-ministerial representatives chosen by the Conferences. Its regular meeting shall be held every second year. Its presiding officer shall be the chief executive officer of the Church, and during his term of office he may be relieved of his pastoral or other duties.

24. The General Council shall have full power :

(1) To determine the number and boundaries of the Conferences, have oversight of them, and review their records.

(2) (a) To legislate on matters respecting the doctrine, worship, membership, and government of the Church, subject to the conditions : First, that before any rule or law relative to these matters can become a permanent law, it must receive the approval of a majority of the Presbyteries, and, if advisable, pastoral charges also ; Second, that

no terms of admission to full membership shall be described other than those laid down in the New Testament ; and, Third, that the freedom of worship at present enjoyed in the negotiating Churches shall not be interfered with in The United Church.

(b) To legislate on all matters respecting property, subject to the limitations elsewhere provided in this Basis of Union, and subject also to the approval of the Conference in which the property is situated.

(3) To prescribe and regulate the course of study of candidates for the ministry and to regulate the admission of ministers from other Churches.

(4) To receive and dispose of petitions, memorials, &c.

(5) To dispose of appeals.

(6) To determine the missionary policy of the Church, and to provide for the conduct of its missions.

(7) To have charge of the colleges of the Church, and to take what measures are deemed advisable for the promotion of Christian education.

(8) To appoint committees or boards and officers for the different departments of church work, and to receive their reports and give them instructions and authority.

(9) To correspond with other Churches.

(10) And in general to enact such legislation and adopt such measures as may tend to promote true godliness, repress immorality, preserve the unity and well-being of the Church, and advance the kingdom of Christ throughout the world.

THE MINISTRY

I. PASTORAL OFFICE, INCLUDING TERM OF SERVICE

Recognizing the desirability of preserving the essence of both the settled pastorate and the itinerancy, the Joint Committee is of the opinion that a harmony of both principles is possible, and that the best features of both

systems may be retained. We, therefore, recommend as follows :

1. The pastoral relation shall be without a time limit.
2. The policy of the Church shall be that every pastoral charge shall have, as far as possible, a pastorate without interruption, and that every effective minister shall have a pastoral charge.
3. There shall be for each Conference a Settlement Committee, consisting of ministers and laymen, and appointed annually by the Conference. On this Committee each Presbytery shall be represented. It shall be the duty of this Committee to consider all applications for settlement from ministers and pastoral charges within the district over which it has jurisdiction. For this purpose it shall meet annually before the meeting of the Conference next after that by which it was appointed.
4. A minister by his own action and a pastoral charge through its constitutional representatives may, by such a date before the annual meeting of the Settlement Committee as the General Council shall determine, seek a change of pastoral relation by means of an application through the Presbytery to the Settlement Committee. All such applications shall be in writing.
5. Any pastoral charge, in view of a vacancy, may extend a call or invitation to any properly qualified minister or ministers, but the right of appointment shall rest with the Settlement Committee, which shall report to the Conference for information only.
6. (a) When a pastoral charge about to become vacant at the end of the Conference year, fails to give a call or invitation within the time specified by the General Council, the Settlement Committee shall make the appointment.
(b) When a pastoral charge becomes vacant during the Conference year through death or other emergency, the Presbytery concerned shall confer with the charge itself or

with its constitutional representatives, and thereafter may arrange a supply for the remainder of the Conference year.

7. The Settlement Committee shall also have authority to initiate correspondence with ministers and pastoral charges with a view to completing arrangements to secure necessary and desirable settlements.

(a) Any minister shall have the right to appear before the Settlement Committee to represent his case in regard to his appointment ; and any pastoral charge or Official Board may also appear by not more than two representatives, properly authorized in writing, appointed from among its members at a regular meeting, or at a special meeting of which proper notice has been given ;

(b) When a minister chosen by a pastoral charge cannot be settled, the charge or its constitutional representatives may place other names before the Settlement Committee :

(c) While the right of appointment shall rest with the Settlement Committee it shall comply as far as possible with the expressed wishes of ministers and pastoral charges.

8. There shall also be a committee for the transfer of ministers from one Conference to another, which may be composed of the presiding officer of the General Council of the Church, who shall be the convener and chairman of the committee, together with the presiding officers of the several Conferences. This committee shall have authority to transfer ministers and candidates for the ministry from one Conference to another, in harmony with the plan outlined in sections 3-7.

9. The minister in charge shall be the presiding officer of the Session and of the Official Board.

10. Every minister or candidate for the ministry, duly appointed regular pastor to a pastoral charge, shall have the right to conduct services in the church, churches or other

places of worship in connexion with said charge ; and the right of occupancy of the manse or parsonage in connexion with said charge, subject, however, to the rules and regulations of The United Church.

II. TRAINING FOR THE MINISTRY

1. No candidate for the ministry shall be received unless he has been first recommended by a session, official board, or local church.

2. The duty of inquiry into the personal character, doctrinal beliefs, and general fitness of candidates for the ministry recommended by sessions, official boards, or local churches, shall be laid upon the Presbytery and such inquiry shall be repeated each year until they are recommended to the Conference for ordination.

3. (1) The attainment of a B.A. degree including Greek, to be followed by three years in the study of Theology, is strongly recommended by the Church. Before ordination every candidate shall spend twelve months in preaching and pastoral work.

(2) In cases where the B.A. degree is unattainable, there shall be two alternative courses, both starting from University matriculation.

(a) Three years, at least, in Arts, followed by three years in Theology. Before ordination every candidate shall spend twelve months in preaching and pastoral work.

(b) Two years' preaching under the supervision of a Presbytery, with appropriate studies, and four years of a mixed Arts and Theological course in college.

4. Suggested Curricula :

(1) Course of study in Arts under (2) (a). English Language and Literature, three years. Two languages, one of which must be Greek, two years in each.

Philosophy, including Psychology, Logic and Ethics two

years, two other subjects from the Arts curriculum at the option of the student—one year in each.

(2) Course of study under (2) (b) :

(a) While under supervision of Presbytery, and engaged in preaching for two years :

English Bible ; New Testament in Greek ; Elements of Theology ; Life of Christ ; History of Missions ; English Literature ; Practical Training, including preparation of sermons.

(b) Four years of mixed Arts and Theological Course in College.

The Arts Course. English Language and Literature ; Philosophy, including Psychology ; Logic and Ethics ; one language ; any one option from the Arts Course.

Theological Course. Homiletics ; Pastoral Theology ; Systematic Theology ; New Testament Languages and Literature ; Old Testament Literature (English Bible) ; Church History ; Christian Ethics and Sociology.

5. The following is suggested as a comprehensive course in Theology, from which may be selected subjects sufficient to constitute the three years' course in Theology as under 3 (1) and (2) (a) :

Old Testament Language and Literature, including Textual Criticism. Exegesis, Biblical Theology, Introduction, Old Testament History and Old Testament Canon ; New Testament Language and Literature, including Textual Criticism. Exegesis, Biblical Theology, Introduction, New Testament History and New Testament Canon ; English Bible ; Church History, including Symbolics ; Systematic Theology ; Apologetics, including Philosophy of Religion, History of Religion, and Comparative Religion ; Christian Ethics and Sociology ; Christian Missions ; Practical Training, including preparation and delivery of sermons, preparation for and conduct of public worship, administration of the Sacraments, Church Law, the art of

teaching and Sunday-school work, public speaking and voice training. Practical Training is to be understood to include not only instruction in these subjects but actual drill wherever the subject admits of it.

6. Provision shall be made in the Theological Colleges for instruction in the subjects of the above suggested course in Theology as far as practicable.

7. In every College special attention shall be given to Practical Training as specified and described above.

8. From the above (5) comprehensive course in Theology the Church shall prescribe certain subjects as compulsory, leaving others to the option of the students in consultation with the College authorities.

9. Candidates for the ministry who have entered on their course in Theology shall be allowed to complete it on the conditions which obtained when they began, but this privilege shall expire within three years from the date of the union.

10. The General Council shall possess the power of ordaining any person to the ministry if it sees fit so to do.

III. THE RELATIONS OF A MINISTER TO THE DOCTRINES OF THE CHURCH

1. The duty of final inquiry into the personal character, doctrinal beliefs, and general fitness of candidates for the Ministry presenting themselves for ordination or for reception as ministers of The United Church shall be laid upon the Conference.

2. These candidates shall be examined on the Statement of Doctrine of The United Church, and shall, before ordination, satisfy the examining body that they are in essential agreement therewith, and that as ministers of the Church they accept the statement as in substance agreeable to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures.

3. Further, in the ordination service before the Conference these candidates shall answer the following questions :

(1) Do you believe yourself to be a child of God, through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ ?

(2) Do you believe yourself to be called of God to the office of the Christian ministry, and your chief motives to be zeal for the glory of God, love for the Lord Jesus Christ, and desire for the salvation of men ?

(3) Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrines required for eternal salvation in our Lord Jesus Christ, and are you resolved out of the said Scriptures to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach nothing which is not agreeable thereto ?

ADMINISTRATION

The Joint Committee, after careful consideration of the Missionary, Educational, and other connexional enterprises of the negotiating Churches, submits the following recommendations in relation thereto :

I. MISSIONS

1. In the administration of the mission work of The United Church there shall be two departments : (a) Home, including all the mission work within the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, and the Bermudas ; (b) Foreign, including the missions already established or that may be established in other countries.

2. For the oversight and administration of these two departments there shall be two Boards to be known as the Board of Home Missions and the Board of Foreign Missions, to be elected in such a manner and endowed with such powers as the General Council may determine.

3. In recognition of the very valuable services rendered

by the Women's Missionary Societies, the union, constitution, and lines of work of these societies shall be determined by the joint action of their Boards, subject to the approval of the General Council.

4. There shall be placed under the administration of the Home Mission Board of The United Church the moneys now administered under the caption of the Sustentation Fund and Church and Parsonage Aid Fund of the Methodist Church; the Home Mission and Augmentation Funds, French Evangelization Fund, and Church and Manse Fund (except that under the Foreign Mission Board) of the Presbyterian Church; the Home Mission Fund of the Congregational Churches; and such portion of the Mission Fund now raised by the Methodist Church, and the Foreign Mission Board of the Presbyterian Church, as is now expended in Canada, Newfoundland, and the Bermudas.

5. There shall be placed under the administration of the Foreign Mission Board of The United Church the Foreign Mission Fund of the Congregational Churches and that portion of the Mission Fund of the Methodist Church and of the Foreign Mission Fund of the Presbyterian Church now expended in other lands.

6. There shall be placed under the administration of the Board of Social Service and Evangelism and the Board of Sunday Schools and Young People's Societies of The United Church the funds now raised for the work of the Departments of Social Service and Evangelism and the Departments of Sunday Schools and Young People's Societies of the negotiating churches.

7. Inasmuch as certain expenses in connexion with the various courts of the Church will have to be met, the ways and means of raising these funds shall be left to the General Council.

II. PUBLISHING INTERESTS

It shall be left to the General Council of The United Church to determine how far the publications now issued by the negotiating Churches shall be amalgamated.¹

III. COLLEGES

The Colleges at present connected with the negotiating Churches exist, each under its own charter, and in various relations to the respective Churches. These relations affect, first, the appointment of the Governing Board, second, the appointment of Professors in the Faculty of Theology ; third, assistance or maintainance from funds controlled by the Church.

1. All the Colleges connected with the three negotiating Churches shall, as far as possible, sustain the same relation to The United Church as, under their charter, they now sustain to the respective churches, until the General

¹ The periodicals published by the Methodist Church are as follows : *Christian Guardian* (weekly), Toronto ; *Epworth Era* (monthly), Toronto ; *The Missionary Outlook* (monthly), Toronto ; *The Wesleyan* (weekly), Halifax, and a Series of Sabbath School Illustrated Papers and Lesson Helps for Teachers and Scholars.

By the Presbyterian Church : *The Presbyterian Record* (monthly), Montreal, and a Series of Sabbath School Illustrated Papers and Lesson Helps for Teachers and Scholars.

The *Congregationalist*, a weekly paper, is published by the Publication Department of the Congregational Union of Canada.

The Methodist Church also possesses a printing plant, and carries on a general publishing business—'The Methodist Book Room,' Toronto—the Eastern section of the Book Committee owning the property in Halifax in which the business is transacted.

The relation of the publishing interests of the Methodist and Presbyterian Churches to their respective Churches and the general methods of management are similar in each case, save that in the case of the Methodist Book concern, allocation of profits is made to the Superannuation Fund.

Council shall determine otherwise and necessary legislation shall give effect to changes made thereby.

2. The policy of the Church shall be the maintenance of a limited number of thoroughly equipped Colleges, due regard being paid to the needs of different parts of the country, and in furtherance of this policy amalgamation shall be effected as soon as possible in localities where two or more Colleges are doing the same class of work.

3. In addition to the Governing Boards of the several Colleges there shall be appointed by the General Council a Board of Education, which shall have such a general oversight of the Educational interests of the Church as the General Council may assign to it, and carry out such measures as may be decided in reference thereto.

4. There shall be a general Educational Fund, administered by the Board of Education, for the purpose of supplementing the revenues of the several colleges and assisting students in their preparation for the ministry, and for such other purposes and under such regulations as the General Council may from time to time determine.

5. The several educational institutions shall be encouraged to obtain permanent endowments for their maintenance, may receive contributions for this and other purposes at any time, and, upon receiving the consent of the Board of Education, may proceed to appeal for such funds.

IV. BENEVOLENT FUNDS

Whereas there exist, in some form, in all the negotiating Churches funds to aid aged and retired ministers, and widows and orphans of ministers, provision for similar purposes shall be made in the constitution of The United Church by such amalgamation or modification of existing methods as may be found practicable ; and such provision shall embrace the following particulars :

1. The rights of present and prospective claimants on existing funds in any of the negotiating churches shall be adequately protected. To this end :

(1) The present capital investments of the various benevolent funds of the negotiating Churches, and the income now contributed to those funds by publishing interests shall be combined into a 'common trust', if practicable. The rights of present claimants and of prospective claimants (the latter being computed as of the date of the union) shall be a first charge on the revenue from this trust. If it be found that differences in the constitution and administration of the several funds are such as to necessitate separate trusts, instead of a common trust, this shall not be a bar to the carrying out of the general plan, because in that case their revenues shall be combined.

(2) The General Council of The United Church shall provide for (a) the assessing of each minister who is a member of any of the existing funds at the date of the union and of all ministers received into or ordained in The United Church after the union, on the basis of stipend or age, or both stipend and age, as the General Council may determine, and (b) the collecting of contributions, which shall be obligatory upon all local churches, based upon an equitable allocation or assessment under the rules to be formulated by the General Council, the minimum of such allocation or assessment being the amount which, together with the revenue from said trust or trusts and the foregoing assessment upon ministers, is requisite to make good the claims of claimants upon the Superannuation Fund to be instituted by the General Council.

2. Claimants on the proposed Fund shall include the following :

(a) All ministers who, at the time of the union, are beneficiaries of existing funds ;

(b) All ministers who, at the time of the union, are regular

contributors to existing funds on the scale provided by their respective denominations ;

(c) All ministers' widows and orphans who are now, or may hereafter become, entitled to participate in the proposed Fund ;

(d) All ministers, not members of or contributors to existing funds, who may signify their desire to become members of and contributors to the proposed Fund, on the basis of payments sanctioned by the General Council of The United Church.

Provision shall be made whereby ministers so applying may, by a certain scale of payments, be entitled to have their claim upon the proposed Fund date from the time of their reception into the ministry of any of the negotiating Churches instead of from the date of the union.

(e) All ministers received into or ordained in the Church after the union inasmuch as they shall be required at the time of their reception or ordination to become members of and contributors to the proposed Fund.

3. The sources of revenue of the proposed Fund shall be the following :

(a) Contributions of ministers who are members of said Fund at its inception, or afterwards become such, on a scale to be adopted by the General Council of the Church.

(b) Offerings in all local churches based upon an equitable allocation to be made by the Board of Management of said Fund, under regulations sanctioned by the General Council.

(c) Legacies and donations given for the purpose.

(d) Such grants from the profits of the publishing interests of the Church as may from time to time be determined under regulations to be framed by the General Council.

(e) Proceeds of any investments that may be made in the interests of the said Fund.

APPENDIX ON LAW

1. When a Basis of Union has been agreed upon by the negotiating Churches, the union should be consummated and The United Church incorporated by a Special Act of the Parliament of Canada.

2. The Act of the Parliament of Canada consummating the Union and incorporating The United Church should contain, among others, provisions to the following effect :

(1) Ratifying and confirming the Basis of Union as agreed upon, and empowering The United Church to acquire and hold property.

(2) Making clear (a) that The United Church shall have the powers of legislation mentioned in sub-paragraph (2) of paragraph 24 of the Polity Section of the Basis of Union, subject to the safeguards thereby imposed, in such full and ample manner as to render impossible the existence in connexion with The United Church of the conditions which have arisen in Scotland in connexion with The United Free Church of Scotland, under the decision of the House of Lords, touching its property and doctrine.

(b) That all the estate, real and personal, belonging to or held in trust for or to the use of the negotiating Churches, or belonging to or held in trust for or to the use of any corporation under the government or control of, or in connexion with, any of the said negotiating Churches, shall be vested in The United Church or in Boards, Committees or Corporations under the control thereof, and shall be used and administered in accordance with the terms and provisions of the Basis of Union.¹

Note. This provision would cover all property which might properly be described as denominational property.

¹ At a meeting of the Presbyterian Union Committee held on December 15, 1914, it was resolved that 'it is expected that in the proposed legislation proper provision will be made to guard the rights or privileges of any minority which may be opposed to Union.'

(c) That, subject to the provisions of the next succeeding paragraph hereof, all property, real and personal, under the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada held in trust for or to the use of a church, charge, circuit, or congregation of any of the negotiating Churches, shall be held by trustees appointed by or on behalf of such church, charge, circuit, or congregation, upon trusts set forth and declared in a Model Trust Deed.

This Model Trust Deed should be a schedule to the Act, and should contain, among others, a provision to the following effect: That the property is held for the church, charge, circuit, or congregation as a part of The United Church, and that no property so held shall be sold, exchanged, or in any manner encumbered unless the Presbytery shall, at the instance of the church, charge, circuit, or congregation, have given its sanction, subject to an appeal, if desired, to the Conference.

(d) That any property or funds owned by a church, charge, circuit, or congregation at the time of the union solely for its own benefit, or vested in trustees for the sole benefit of such church, charge, circuit, or congregation, and not for the denomination of which the said church, charge, circuit, or congregation formed a part, shall not be affected by the legislation giving effect to the union or by any legislation of The United Church without the consent of the church, charge, circuit, or congregation for which said property is held in trust.

Note. To avoid uncertainty as to title, all churches, charges, circuits, or congregations coming within the provision of this clause should be named in a schedule attached to the Act, and the provisions of this section should be limited to the churches, charges, circuits, or congregations so enumerated in the schedule.

(e) That all lands, premises, and property acquired for the use of a local church or a pastoral charge of The

United Church shall be held, used, and administered upon the trusts of the said Model Trust Deed above referred to.

3. Special acts of the Legislatures of the several Provinces of the Dominion and of Newfoundland and the Bermudas and any other country in which the negotiating Churches hold property should be obtained, containing similar provisions and vesting in the manner above indicated the above and like classes of property and interests over which the said Legislatures may respectively have jurisdiction, and rendering effective in the said several jurisdictions the other provisions relating to the said union.

66. Report of Conferences between the Committee of the Presbytery of Montreal on the Reunion of the Churches in Relation to the Lambeth Conference and a similar Committee appointed by the Bishop of Montreal

MAY 1921

The following is a list of the members of the two Committees :

I. Presbyterian

Chairman : Rev. Professor Welsh

Principal Fraser.	Rev. S. T. Martin.
Professor A. R. Gordon.	Rev. E. J. Rattee.
Rev. Dr. Clarke.	Rev. A. S. Ross.
Rev. Dr. Dickie.	Dr. G. A. Berwick.
Rev. Dr. Duncan.	Mr. W. S. Leslie.
Rev. Dr. Hanson.	Dr. D. A. Murray.
Rev. A. G. McKinnon.	Mr. James Roger.
Rev. J. B. Maclean.	

2. *Anglican*

Chairman : The Bishop of Montreal

Archdeacon Paterson Smyth.	Rev. J. E. Fee.
Canon Rexford.	Rev. W. H. Davison.
Canon Horsey.	Rev. A. H. Moore.
Canon Willis.	Rev. R. K. Naylor.
Canon Shatford.	Rev. R. Y. Overing.
Canon Almond.	Chancellor Davidson.
Rev. Dr. Abbott-Smith.	Professor H. A. Smith.
Rev. Dr. Howard.	

The Conference was organized under the joint chairmanship of Bishop Farthing and Professor Welsh, and Dr. D. A. Murray and Dr. O. W. Howard were appointed joint secretaries.

There were five Conferences held, on the following dates : January 28, February 11, March 4, May 17, and May 20, 1921.

It having been agreed to consider first questions of *Faith* and then to pass to the subject of *Order*, the following Resolutions were successively adopted by the Conference :

I. FAITH

That the Lambeth Statement represents the view of this Conference—namely :

‘ We believe that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole-hearted acceptance of—

‘ The Holy Scriptures, as the record of God’s revelation of Himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith, and the Creed commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith, and either it or the Apostles’ Creed as the Baptismal confession of belief.

‘ The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ.

‘ A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body.’ (*Lambeth Appeal*, Sec. VI.)

II. ORDER

The following Resolution, dealing with Sections VII and VIII of the *Lambeth Appeal*, was adopted :

‘ In view of the ultimate ideal of a reunited Christendom a representative and constitutional Episcopate, co-ordinated with Synodical, Presbyterian, and Congregational representation, is adapted to the achievement of the larger unity.’

At the third conference the following Resolution was submitted, but not formally adopted. A joint sub-committee was appointed to deal with the same, the text of which is here given, as it formed the basis for subsequent discussion and action :

‘ In view of any action involving union between the Anglican and Presbyterian Communions, Bishops and Clergy of the Anglican Communion would accept a form of Presbyterian Commission, and Ministers of the Presbyterian Communion would accept a form of Episcopal Commission. Any who at the time of union may not desire to receive such a commission, entitling them to officiate at all acts of worship in the united Church, would retain their present status and functions.’ (Compare *Lambeth Report*, p. 143.¹)

After several meetings both of the joint sub committee and of the separate committees, the joint committee submitted to the fourth conference forms of reciprocal commission, which, after amendment, were adopted in the following form :

I. *Presbyterian Form of Commission to Anglicans*

A declaration will be made to the effect that there is no repudiation of or reflection on the Ministry to which we have been set apart by the Holy Spirit, but that the authorization is given to enable us to exercise the Ministry in a wider

¹ See p. 13, No. 3 *supra*.

sphere within the reunited Church. The exact phraseology of this has not been determined.

Then the clergy of the Church of England in Canada will be admitted according to the form in the 'Draft of the Book of Common Order of the Presbyterian Church in Canada', pp. 35 and 36, as follows :

Now may be sung 'Come, Holy Ghost, our souls inspire', or other hymn of supplication for the presence of the Holy Spirit. Then shall the Candidate kneel, and other Presbyters standing about him, the Moderator shall say : Since no man is of himself sufficient for these things let us call upon God in prayer.

Let us pray.

Almighty and most merciful Father, who of Thine infinite goodness has given Thine only Son Jesus Christ to be our Redeemer and the Author of eternal life, and hast exalted Him unto Thy right Hand, from whence, according to Thy will, He hath sent down the Holy Ghost and given gifts unto men, send down, we pray Thee, the Holy Ghost upon this Thy servant, whom, in Thy name, and in obedience to Thy most blessed will, we now by the laying on of our hands (*Here the Moderator and other Presbyters lay their hands on the head of the Candidate*) admit to a wider exercise of the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments.

We entreat Thee to grant unto Thy servant, to whom this sacred trust is now committed, such fullness of grace as shall fit him more and more for the work to which he has been called. Give him utterance, that he may boldly make known Thy word and will, and faithfully dispense the mysteries of the Gospel. Endue him with wisdom and zeal to rule aright the people over whom Thou hast set him and to preserve them in peace and purity, so that Thy Church, under his administration and example, may increase in grace and holiness. Strengthen him by Thy Spirit, that he may abide steadfast to the end, and be received, with all Thy faithful servants, into the joy of his Lord.

O God, give grace, we beseech Thee, to Thy people to whom Thy servant is to minister in holy things, that they may be enlightened by divine truth, edified by the Ministry of the Word, quickened by the Spirit of Life, established in

all holy living, guided into manifold Christian labours, and used for the furtherance of the Saviour's kingdom. May both Minister and People be kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation.

Our Father which art in heaven, &c.

Now unto Him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto Him be glory in the Church by Jesus Christ throughout all ages world without end. Amen.

Prayer being ended, the Minister shall rise, and the Moderator, addressing him, shall say :

In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, the only King and Head of the Church, and by authority of this Presbytery, I invite you to take part with us in this Ministry, and admit you to all the rights and privileges thereto pertaining.

Then the Members of the Presbytery shall give him the right hand of fellowship, the Moderator saying :

We give you the right hand of fellowship to take part with us in this Ministry.

The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you. Amen.

2. Anglican Form of Commission to Presbyterians

STATEMENT. *The Candidates having been presented to the Bishop, then shall the Bishop say :*

Forasmuch as terms have been arranged between the Church of England in Canada, and the Presbyterian Church in Canada, with the purpose of realizing, through a visible and corporate union, their common fellowship in the Universal Church of Christ, and of manifesting that fellowship to the world, and forasmuch as it is necessary that there should be in this united Church a Ministry that shall be acknowledged in every part thereof, it is our purpose now to give to these our brethren, by the laying on of our hands, a commission to the office of priesthood, it being clearly understood that herein there is no repudiation of, or reflection on, their past ministry, to which they were set apart

by the Holy Spirit, whose call led them to that Ministry and whose power enabled them to perform the same.

INVOCATION. *Then shall be said or sung, 'Come, Holy Ghost,' &c.*

PRAYER. *Then shall the Bishop say :*

Almighty God and heavenly Father, Who of Thine infinite love and goodness towards us hast given to us Thy only and most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ, to be our Redeemer and the Author of everlasting life, who, after He had made perfect our redemption by His death, and was ascended into heaven, sent abroad into the world His Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Doctors, and Pastors, by whose labour and ministry He gathered together a great flock in all the parts of the world, to set forth the eternal praise of Thy Holy Name : For these so great benefits of Thy eternal goodness, and for that Thou hast vouchsafed to call these Thy servants here present to the same office and ministry, appointed for the salvation of mankind, to be exercised in the wider sphere of the united Church, we render unto Thee most hearty thanks, we praise and worship Thee, and we humbly beseech Thee, by the same Thy blessed Son to grant unto all, which either here or elsewhere call upon Thy holy Name, that we may continue to show ourselves thankful unto Thee for these and all other Thy benefits, and that we may daily increase and go forward in the knowledge and faith of Thee and Thy Son, by the Holy Spirit. So that as well by these thy Ministers, as by them over whom they shall be appointed thy Ministers, Thy Holy Name may be for ever glorified, and Thy blessed kingdom enlarged ; through the same Thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord, Who liveth and reigneth with Thee in the unity of the same Holy Spirit, world without end. Amen.

COMMISSION. *Then the Candidates shall kneel, and the Bishop with the Priests present shall lay hands severally on the head of every one, the Bishop saying :*

Take thou authority to execute this office now committed to thee by the imposition of our hands. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God and of His holy Sacraments. In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

NOTE. The following was not formally brought before the Conference, but had it been it would doubtless have passed.

Presbyterian Form of Commission to Anglicans

STATEMENT. *The Candidate having presented himself before the Moderator of Presbytery, the Moderator shall say :*

Forasmuch as terms have been arranged between the Presbyterian Church in Canada and the Church of England in Canada, with the purpose of realizing, through a visible and corporate union, their common fellowship in the Universal Church of Christ, and of manifesting that fellowship to the world, and forasmuch as it is necessary that there should be in this united Church a Ministry that shall be acknowledged in every part thereof, it is our purpose now to give to this our brother, by the laying on of our hands, a commission to take part with us in this Ministry, it being clearly understood that herein there is no repudiation of or reflection on their past Ministry, to which they were set apart by the Holy Spirit, whose call led them to that Ministry and whose power enabled them to perform the same. *Amen.*

67. The Presbyterian Church in Canada

RESOLUTIONS ON THE LAMBETH APPEAL ADOPTED BY THE
GENERAL ASSEMBLY, JUNE 1921

I. That the Assembly express its great joy and its gratitude to God in learning of the proposal of the Lambeth Conference, as transmitted to the Assembly by the Primate of the Church of England in Canada.

The Assembly acknowledges and reciprocates that expression of warm brotherly feeling, and pledges itself to co-operate with the General Synod of the Anglican Church and with any other Church which may desire to consider along with us the great questions that have been mooted concerning the Reunion of Christendom.

2. That the Assembly request the Moderator to send to the Primate a reply expressing the sentiments of the Assembly on the subject.

3. That the General Assembly having in view the value of the reports which have reached its Committee regarding conferences already held in several parts of the Dominions counsel Synods and Presbyteries to hold themselves in readiness to enter upon such conferences, as these may be arranged for, and request that reports of proceedings be sent to the Assembly's Committee on Union. That the Assembly further express the opinion that in such conferences due regard be had to the largeness of the issues and the complexity of the questions involved and to the necessity of securing harmony of action throughout this Province of the Dominion.

68. *The Church of England in Canada*

RESOLUTIONS ON THE LAMBETH APPEAL ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL SYNOD, OCTOBER 1921

[These Resolutions, originally adopted by the Upper House, were concurred in by the Lower House, and thus became the action of the Synod. See also Resolutions quoted in the Archbishop of Rupert's Land's letter to Dr. Gordon, which follows.]

1. The Upper House of the General Synod of the Church of England in Canada welcomes and adopts the 'Appeal to all Christian People' contained in Resolution No. 9 of the Lambeth Conference.

2. The Upper House accepts Resolution No. 10 of the Lambeth Conference as follows :

'The Conference recommends to the authorities of the Churches of the Anglican Communion that they should, in such ways and at such times as they think best, formally invite the authorities of "other Churches"

within their area to confer with them concerning the possibility of taking definite steps to co-operate in a common endeavour, on the lines set forth in the Appeal, to restore the unity of the Church of Christ.'

3. The Upper House also confirms the following Resolution No. 12 (B) (I) and (II) of the Lambeth Conference Report, as follows :

'I. . . . It cannot approve of general schemes of inter-Communion or exchange of pulpits.

'II. In accordance with the principle of Church order set forth in the Preface to the Ordinal attached to the Book of Common Prayer, it cannot approve the celebration in Anglican Churches of the Holy Communion for members of the Anglican Church by ministers who have not been episcopally ordained ; and [declares] that it should be regarded as the general rule of the Church that Anglican communicants should receive Holy Communion only at the hands of ministers of their own Church, or of Churches in Communion therewith.'

The Upper House also accepts Resolution No. (A) I of the Lambeth Conference as defined in the following terms :

'The Bishops of the Church of England in Canada will support the action of any Bishop who, provided there be no "Canonical Impediment" gives occasional authorization to Ministers not episcopally ordained, to preach in Churches within his Diocese, and to Clergy of his Diocese to preach in the Churches of such Ministers, provided that, in his opinion, such Ministers are working towards an ideal of union, such as is described in the Lambeth Appeal, it being clearly and distinctly understood that this involves' :

A. The whole-hearted acceptance by such ministers of all set forth in paragraph VI of the 'Appeal to all Christian People' which is as follows :

'We believe that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole-hearted acceptance of :

'The Holy Scriptures, as the record of God's revelation of

Himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; and the Creed commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient standard of the Christian faith, and either it or the Apostles' Creed as the Baptismal Confession of belief:

'The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ;

'A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole Body.'

B. An expression of their approval of the ultimate acceptance of Episcopacy for the United Church.

4. The Upper House accepts Resolution 12 (A) (II), which is as follows:

'The Bishops of the Anglican Communion will not question the action of any Bishop who, in the few years between the initiation and the completion of a "definite scheme" of union, shall countenance the irregularity of admitting to Communion the baptized but unconfirmed Communicants of the non-episcopal congregations concerned in the scheme.'

They define the meaning of it as follows:

'That by the words "Initiation . . . of a definite scheme of Union", in Resolution 12 (A) (II), we understand the formal adoption by the authorities of our Communion, and of a negotiating Communion, of a scheme of union based on the acceptance of the Lambeth Appeal.'

69. *The General Assembly of the Presbyterian
Church in Canada*

JUNE 9, 1922

[Extracted from the Proceedings]

STATEMENT FROM UNION COMMITTEE ON THE APPEAL OF
THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE

Dr. Gordon presented the following correspondence with the Primate of the Church of England in Canada :

BISHOP'S COURT,
WINNIPEG, MANITOBA,
MAY 4TH, 1922.

MY DEAR DR. GORDON,

It will be remembered that after the return of the Bishops from the Lambeth Conference I sent, under instructions from the House of Bishops, to the Heads of the various Churches a copy of the Appeal on Reunion addressed to all Christian people. At that time I promised that after the General Synod of the Church of England in Canada had considered the Lambeth Report I would forward a further communication. I am now able to inform you that the General Synod has adopted the Lambeth Report on Reunion and, looking towards further action, has passed the following resolution :

‘ That His Grace the Primate be requested to convey officially to the Heads or representative authorities of all Christian Churches in Canada, Episcopal as well as Non-Episcopal, information concerning the action of this General Synod regarding the question of Christian Union.

‘ And further, that His Grace be requested to inform them that this General Synod has appointed a Committee to confer with similar Committees appointed by the authorities of any other Christian Communion in the Dominion,

upon lines that are in general harmony with the principles underlying "The Appeal and Resolution of the Lambeth Conference" and to assure our brethren of our most earnest hope and desire that they may find it possible to appoint such committees to meet with us in conference in order that the divisions of the Church may be ended and the wounds healed which at present cripple the Body of Christ in its Life and Work of witness.'

In accordance with the above, the Synod appointed a large Committee composed of Bishops, Clergy, and Laymen, with a smaller Executive Committee selected from its membership, which is charged with the duty of carrying on official negotiations with any other committee appointed officially to confer with the Church of England in Canada upon the subject of Reunion upon lines that are in harmony with the principles underlying the Lambeth Appeal and Resolutions as adopted by this General Synod, of reporting from time to time a synopsis of its proceedings to all members of the Committee, and of reporting in full to a meeting or meetings of the whole Committee before any final decisions are adopted or any report presented to the General Synod.

I write now to ask :

- (a) Whether your Church is willing to appoint representatives to meet with us ;
- (b) To ascertain the approximate date when conferences may conveniently take place ; and
- (c) Where, in your opinion, would be the most suitable place for meeting.

I may add that the Autumn sessions of the various Committees of our General Synod will be held probably in Brantford or London in the month of September, and, in this country of vast distances it might save both expense and time, were it possible for some of the conferences to take place at that date and in Ontario.

It is needless for me to state that we are profoundly impressed with the supreme importance of following the lead of the Lambeth Conference in its endeavour to bring about Union in our divided Christendom. Our hopes may not be realized at once, and some of us may not live to see them realized, but let us work and pray towards the great end for which Our Lord prayed—‘That we all may be one.’ With kindest regards, and all good wishes, I am,

Most sincerely yours,

S. P. RUPERT’S LAND,

VERY REV. DR. GORDON,

Primate.

MODERATOR,

54 WESTGATE, WINNIPEG, MAN.

HIS GRACE,

5TH JUNE 1922.

THE PRIMATE OF CANADA,

BISHOP’S COURT, WINNIPEG.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP MATHESON,

May I first of all express my great satisfaction and gratitude at receiving your letter anent the action of the General Synod of the Church of England in Canada in connexion with the Lambeth Report. I shall be pleased to lay this letter before the General Assembly which meets in this city on the 7th instant.

It, of course, is impossible for me to anticipate what action the General Assembly will take, but I am certain that I can assure you of the earnest desire of the Presbyterian Church to co-operate with the great Church which you represent and other Christian Churches, in seeking to achieve the union of those Churches that profess a common faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.

I note the points upon which you ask definite information as to the appointment of representatives to a conference on this matter, and as to the date and place of meeting for this

conference. The Assembly no doubt will cover these points in its answer.

May I express the hope and the conviction that all those who seek to bring about an object so greatly to be desired will be guided by the Spirit of God and will arrive at a solution that will be for His honour and glory, for the advancement of His Church on earth and for the well-being of mankind.

And I venture to cherish also the hope—you see I am a little more optimistic than your Grace—that if I live out the extra span of life allotted by the Psalmist I shall see your great Church and ours united, under God's guidance, in visible bonds of Christian faith and fellowship.

I am, with very kind regards,

Very sincere yours,

CHARLES W. GORDON,

MODERATOR.

Dr. Gordon then submitted the following reply, which the Union Committee suggests should be sent to His Grace the Primate of the Church of England in Canada :

[REPLY]

The General Assembly expresses its warm appreciation of the Christian courtesy of His Grace in communicating to the General Assembly the action of the General Synod of the Church of England in Canada anent the matter of Christian Union ;

Cordially reciprocates the sentiments of the General Synod and of His Grace the Primate in regard to this all-important question ;

Pledges hearty and cordial co-operation in all wise efforts to further the cause of Christian Union in Canada ; and

Instructs its Union Committee to appoint a Sub-Committee charged with the duty of negotiating with similar

Committees of other Churches seeking to confer upon the question of Christian Reunion in Canada upon lines that are in general harmony with the principles laid down in the Appeal and Resolutions of the Lambeth Conference, and to arrange in consultation with those similar Committees all necessary details as to time, place, and conditions of a conference to be held as soon as convenient.

The General Assembly further assures His Grace the Primate and, through him, the General Synod of the Church of England in Canada of its most earnest desire and prayer that the Spirit of God may so order the minds and move the hearts of all true believers in our Lord Jesus Christ that soon the sad divisions that now separate God's people from one another may disappear and all true lovers of our blessed Lord be united in faith and in service for the glory of God and for the well-being of our land and of the world.

On motion of Dr. Gordon, seconded by Dr. George Duncan, the recommendation of the Union Committee was adopted.

XIV. CHINA

70. *The General Synod of the Chung-hua Sheng Kung Hui*

RESOLUTIONS ON THE LAMBETH APPEAL APRIL 1921

[The Chung-hua Sheng Kung Hui is the name given to the branch of the Anglican Communion in China. The Lambeth Appeal has been translated into Chinese (1923), and a short tract in Chinese has also been issued (1922).]

House of Delegates concurring, that this Synod heartily endorses the 'Appeal to All Christian People' issued by the Bishops assembled in the Lambeth Conference of 1920, and instructs its Committee on Unity to send it, with a covering letter, to the Heads of Christian Churches and Missions in China.

House of Delegates concurring, that this General Synod of the Chung-hua Sheng Kung Hui endorses the Resolutions of the Lambeth Conference on the subject of Reunion, in as far as they bear upon our work in China, as a general guide to our conduct.

House of Delegates concurring, that this General Synod of the Chung-hua Sheng Kung Hui humbly accepts its responsibility to enter into negotiations with other Christian Churches in China, with a view to taking definite steps to co-operate in a common endeavour to restore the unity of the Church of Christ.

House of Delegates concurring, that the General Synod instructs the Standing Committee on Church Unity to issue a short tract for general circulation on the Lambeth Appeal and other Resolutions of the Lambeth Conference on the subject of Unity.

House of Delegates concurring, that the General Synod requests the Chairman of the two Houses in co-operation with the Standing Committee on Unity to undertake the task of opening negotiations towards Unity, as opportunity may offer, with other Christian Churches in China.

House of Delegates concurring, that it is desirable that individual Bishops should arrange informal conferences on Unity between members of the Chung-hua Sheng Kung Hui and other Churches within their Dioceses, and it is suggested that the findings of such Conferences be sent for information to the Standing Committee on Unity, and to the Bishop of Bombay, Secretary of the Continuation Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order.

House of Delegates concurring, that the General Synod recognizes that the National Christian Conference which it is proposed to hold in Shanghai in May 1922 promises to afford a valuable opportunity for Conference both as to practical co-operation in Christian work, and as to means for setting forward that mutual understanding and goodwill which are essential to substantial progress in manifesting the fundamental Unity of the Christian Church. The General Synod therefore welcomes the endeavours being made to arrange for this National Conference and commends them to the support of all Diocesan authorities of the Chung-hua Sheng Kung Hui.

XV. SOUTH INDIA

71. Statement drawn up by Thirty-three Ministers of the Anglican and South India United Churches at Tranquebar, May 1 and 2, 1919

[The South India United Church (constituted in 1908) was formed by the union of Christian congregations connected with five separate missions in South India: the London Missionary Society and the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (both Congregational), the Church of Scotland, the United Free Church of Scotland, and the Dutch Reformed Church in America. Congregations of the Basel Mission were also later incorporated.]

We, as individual members of the Anglican Communion and the South India United Church, having met at Tranquebar in the first Ministers' Conference on church union, after prayer, thought, and discussion, have agreed on the following statement concerning the union of the Anglican Church with the South India United Church:

We believe that the union is the will of God, even as our Lord prayed that we might be one, that the world might believe. We believe that union is the teaching of Scripture. 'There is one body, and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all.'

We believe that the challenge of the present hour in the period of reconstruction after the war, in the gathering together of the nations, and the present critical situation in India itself, call us to mourn our past divisions and turn to our Lord Jesus Christ to seek in Him the unity of the body expressed in one visible Church. We face together the titanic task of the winning of India for Christ—one-fifth

of the human race. Yet, confronted by such an overwhelming responsibility, we find ourselves rendered weak and relatively impotent by our unhappy divisions—divisions for which we were not responsible, and which have been, as it were, imposed upon us from without ; divisions which we did not create, and which we do not desire to perpetuate.

In this Church we believe that three Scriptural elements must be conserved : (1) The *Congregational* element, representing 'the whole Church', with 'every member' having immediate access to God, each exercising his gift for the development of the whole body. (2) We believe it should include the delegated, organized, or *Presbyterian* element, whereby the Church could unite in a General Assembly, Synods or Councils in organized unity. (3) We believe it should include the representative, executive, or *Episcopal* element. Thus all three elements, no one of which is absolute or sufficient without the others, should be included in the Church of the future, for we aim not at compromise for the sake of peace, but at comprehension for the sake of truth.

In seeking union, the Anglican members present stand for the one ultimate principle of *the historic Episcopate*. They ask the 'acceptance of the fact of episcopacy and not any theory as to its character'. The South India United Church members believe it is 'a necessary condition that the Episcopate *should reassume a constitutional form*' on the primitive, simple, apostolic model. While the Anglicans ask for the historic Episcopate, the members of the South India United Church also make one condition of union, namely, the recognition of *spiritual equality*, of the universal priesthood of all believers, and of the rights of the laity to their full expression in the Church. They ask that this principle of spiritual equality shall be maintained throughout at every step of the negotiations.

Upon this common ground of the historic Episcopate and of spiritual equality of all members of the two Churches, we propose union on the following basis :

- (1) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments,
as containing all things necessary to salvation.
- (2) The Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed.
- (3) The two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—
Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

We understand that the acceptance of the fact of the Episcopate does not involve the acceptance of any theory of the origin of episcopacy nor any doctrinal interpretation of the fact. It is further agreed that the terms of union should involve no Christian community in the necessity of disowning its past, and we find it no part of our duty to call in question the validity of each other's orders.

Fully recognizing that we do not commit our respective bodies to any action, we individually and unofficially agree upon the following plan of union : After full deliberation, let the South India United Church, if it desires union, choose from its own members certain men who shall be consecrated as bishops. In the consecration of these first bishops it is suggested that three or more bishops of the Anglican Church shall lay their hands upon the candidates, together with an equal number of ministers as representatives of the South India United Church.

As soon as the first bishops are consecrated, the two bodies would be in intercommunion, but the further limitation of existing ministers with regard to celebrating the Communion in the churches of the other body might still remain. In accordance with the principle of spiritual equality we desire to find some means to permit ministers of either body to celebrate the Communion in the churches of the other body.

While not committing our respective bodies, we, un-

officially and individually, with the blessing of God, agree to work towards union on such a basis.

As one possible solution, we would suggest that a special Service of *Commission* should be held. All ministers of both bodies desiring authority to officiate at the Communion throughout the whole Church should present themselves to receive at the hands of all the bishops of the United Churches a commission for such celebration of the Communion. Ministers of either body not desiring to officiate at the Communion in the other Church would be under no obligation to present themselves. Full liberty would be claimed for individuals on the extreme wing of each body to maintain their present views and practices.

72. Statement from the Malabar Suffragan and other Members of the Mar Thoma Syrian Church

JUNE 1919.

[No action has been taken as yet (1924) by the authorities of this Church.]

As individual members of the Mar Thoma Syrian Church, we have received an invitation from certain pastors of the Anglican Communion and of the South India United Church who met at Tranquebar, May 1 and 2, 1919, in the Ministers' Conference on Church Union, requesting the members of the Mar Thoma Syrian Church prayerfully to consider with them the question of uniting the divided Churches of Christ in India. This appeals to us the more deeply, as we ourselves have been praying fervently for years for the healing of the sad divisions which have rent asunder the Church of Christ. These divisions have been particularly disastrous and destructive in India, where the Church has at times become almost a byword among the non-Christians, where religion which was meant to unite mankind has actually divided it.

We agree with you that union is the will of God, and that instead of being responsible for perpetuating the divisions of Christ's Church, we should seek to answer our Lord's prayer that we all may be one.

We also believe that the awakening of a new national consciousness in India, and the entry upon a new era of responsible government, makes it imperative that the Church also, instead of wasting its strength in internal strife, should face the new conditions and work for unity in order to meet the overwhelming demand of the hour. After centuries of the bitter experience of disunion, we, like yourselves, do not desire to perpetuate such divisions.

We are glad to see that you propose union not on any basis of compromise but on one of comprehension, where each body shall contribute its treasures and tradition to the enrichment of the whole. We understand that you do not ask us to change our long-cherished convictions, principles, and practices which we have maintained for centuries in the face of bitter persecution. We also understand that you do not ask us to surrender our autonomy or lose our freedom of action in things pertaining to our own communion.

[We see that you propose union on the basis of four articles, and by two definite methods, with all of which we find ourselves in hearty agreement. In the Constitution of our Church all the four articles mentioned are incorporated as the unchangeable fundamentals of our faith.

1. We have held that the Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary for salvation, and have stood for the principle of the open Bible, which has never been forbidden to the people.

2. We have always held the Nicene Creed, and it forms a part of our regular services. While we accept all the doctrines contained in the Apostles' Creed, it has not been our practice to use it in formal worship.

3. We have always held the two sacraments of Baptism

and the Lord's Supper, administered with Christ's words of institution and the elements He used.

4. We have always stood strongly for maintaining the historic Episcopate, but we agree with you that it is no part of our duty to call in question the validity of each other's orders.

A brief statement of the history of our ancient Church will serve to show our position with regard to the above articles, and our attitude toward them.

We have always held firmly to the tradition that our Church was founded by St. Thomas, the Apostle of Christ, in the first century. Many historians, both ancient and modern, have adduced evidence in support of this tradition, but whether or not it can be proved historically, it is certain that following the fourth century there is undoubted proof that a strong and influential Church existed in South India as shown by its monuments, ancient Persian inscriptions, copperplate characters, and statements of travellers and historians.

In the year A. D. 345 a large emigration of Christians from Syria arrived. During the following centuries connexion was maintained with the Eastern Churches. In the period of strong Nestorian Missions to Asia the Church for a time would seem to have been related to the Bishops of Persia. From A. D. 1054, when the Western and Eastern Churches divided, we stood with the Eastern Churches and maintained the original wording of the Nicene Creed, objecting to the later Western insertion of the single word *filioque* (from the Son). We even now say that the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father is worshipped with the Father and the Son (St. John xv. 26). While under this controversy there lay deep race prejudice between the East and the West, and the firm refusal of the East to admit the growing exclusive claims of the Papacy, we nevertheless feel to-day that it is

incomprehensible to think of perpetuating the division of the Church of Christ, and shattering its strength over a contention about a word. Confronted to-day by the call to return to our original obligation of winning the world, we find ourselves united by a common task, and in the very presence of Christ our Lord lifted to a plane which transcends the medieval dissensions which formerly divided us. A century ago a mission of help was sent by the Anglican Church which led to the quickening and vitalizing of our own isolated communion. Deeply indebted as we are for the self-denying labours of the representatives of the Anglican Church on our behalf, we are all the more glad that the proposal for union comes also from the Church to which we have been so long indebted.

We believe that it is under the guidance of the Spirit that union is now proposed between the Anglican, Syrian, and Free Church bodies. This would unite three Churches representing the Western Catholic, the Eastern Catholic, and the Free Protestant Churches. It would be the first instance in history where union has been effected between the East and the West, between Catholic and Protestant, between episcopal and non-episcopal bodies. The prayer of centuries would thus be answered.

We are ready to consider union now that a definite proposal has come from members of the Anglican and South India United Churches. As the Church of England has for three decades suggested conditions for union, we hope that our Synod will also favourably consider the same and take steps for effecting union upon this common ground. We understand that there is no question of the absorption of one Church by another, but that standing on the principle of spiritual equality before our common Lord, we shall each seek to contribute the riches of our own spiritual inheritance to the United Church of the future. We shall be glad if this

union brings the long-desired dawn of a new day of Christian unity, when there shall be neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, neither East nor West, but as our Lord prayed we shall all be one in Him.

While writing unofficially without committing our Metropolitan and the Synod of our Church, which will have to take final action upon the matter, we as individual members of the Mar Thoma Syrian Church, with the blessing of God, agree to pray and work toward union upon such a basis.

ABRAHAM MAR THOMA (*Malabar Suffragan*).

C. P. PHILIPOSE.

V. P. MAMMAN.

73. Resolutions on Church Union

ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE SOUTH
INDIA UNITED CHURCH AT ITS REGULAR MEETING, ON
SEPTEMBER 29, 1919

The General Assembly of the S.I.U.C. rejoices to see the growing desire for a United Church in India, which is manifested in the opinions of both individuals and organizations, and desires to express its fullest sympathy with the idea of union with the Anglican and Mar Thoma Syrian Churches.

It therefore requests its Councils to consider the desirability or otherwise of adopting a constitutional episcopacy

(1) in which the bishops shall be elected by, and be responsible to, the General Assembly,

(2) in which there shall be a mutual recognition of the absolute equality of the ministry and of the membership of the uniting Churches, and

(3) in which the resultant Church shall be an autonomous and independent entity.

It requests the Councils to send their opinions concerning this matter to the Secretary of the S.I.U.C. before February 1, 1920.

The General Assembly also recommends that, when all the answers from the Councils have been received, the Secretary shall draft a report of the decisions and submit the same to the Councils for their information.

The Assembly further resolves to instruct its Executive Committee to confer with the representatives of the Anglican and Mar Thoma Syrian Churches, and of such other bodies as they deem wise, with a view to the possibility of union.

When the Executive Committee has completed this investigation it shall call a meeting of its own members together with the following persons and shall draw up a memorandum for submission to the Councils for consideration, and for presentation to the next General Assembly for action.

The additional members shall be Revs. F. Kingsbury, J. H. Maclean, C. G. Marshall, S. B. Simon, J. S. Masillamony, G. G. Brown and E. H. Lewis, and Messrs. Paul Daniel, A. Arulappan, J. R. Sivasubramanian and K. T. Paul.

74. *Resolution of the Episcopal Synod of the Province of India and Ceylon*

FEBRUARY 1920

That the Synod, having heard with great interest of the action of the South India United Church in appointing a Committee to confer with the Anglican Church on the possibility of union on the basis of the Lambeth Quadri-lateral,

(a) welcomes the desire of the South India United Church to promote the reunion of Christendom and heartily reciprocates it ;

(b) appoints a Committee consisting of the Metropolitan, the Bishops of Dornakal (Convener), Madras, Bombay, Tinnevely, the Venerable L. E. Cox, the Reverends C. G. Stapley, E. A. L. Moore, P. B. Emmett, Canon C. S. Rivington, Canon Joshi, Canon J. S. C. Banerji (Lucknow Diocese), D. M. Periyamayakan, S. G. Maduram, T. K. Benjamin, and P. Appaswami, Esq., to confer with representatives of the South India United Church and to discuss the measures of agreement and the points of difference between the two Bodies ;

(c) requests that the Metropolitan fill vacancies in the Committee as required.

75. *First Preliminary Report*

First Preliminary Report of the Special Sub-Committee appointed by the Episcopal Synod of India and Ceylon, and of Representatives of the Committee appointed by the General Assembly of the South India United Church to consider proposals for union with other Churches.

MARCH 1920

The former Sub-Committee consisted of : The Right Rev. the Bishop of Bombay, the Right Rev. the Bishop of Dornakal, the Right Rev. the Bishop of Tinnevely, the Rev. Canon G. S. Rivington, and the Rev. S. G. Maduram, B.A. ; K. T. Paul, Esq., B.A., O.B.E. (absent).

The S.I.U.C. Representatives were : Rev. A. W. Brough, *President*, S.I.U.C. ; Rev. J. M. Kesari, B.A., *Vice-President*, S.I.U.C. ; Rev. John J. Banninga, M.A., D.D., *Secretary*, S.I.U.C. ; Rev. V. Santiago, *Ex-President* ; Rev. L. R. Scudder, M.D., *Ex-President* ; Rev. Meshach Peter (*Secretary Madras Council*) ; E. J. Kallat, Esq., M.A. (*Secretary Malabar Council*) ; Rev. K. Sumitra, B.A. (*Secretary Canarese Council*) ; S. Gnanamoni, Esq., B.A., L.T.

(*Secretary N. Tamil Council*) ; J. V. Chelliah, Esq., M.A. (*Jaffna Council*) ; Rev. J. H. Maclean, B.D. (absent).

The two committees met in the Hudson Memorial Church (Wesleyan), Bangalore, March 18 and 19, 1920.

The first session was opened with a devotional service conducted by the Bishop of Dornakal as convener of the Anglican Sub-Committee.

The conference was organized by choosing the Bishop of Dornakal as Chairman and the Rev. J. J. Banninga and the Bishop of Tinnevely as Joint-secretaries.

The second day's session was opened by a devotional service conducted by the Bishop of Bombay and the last session was closed by prayer and benediction by the Rev. A. W. Brough. The spirit of prayer prevailed throughout the sessions.

FINDINGS

Preamble. As representatives of the Anglican and South India United Churches, after prayerful deliberation for two days, we accept the following as a preliminary statement of matters on which we found agreement, recognizing that we have not included all matters that might be considered and that we do not have authority to bind our Churches to an acceptance of these items as their official action. We look forward in future meetings to making a fuller survey of the whole ground.

I. We are agreed :

1. That the only union which Christians should aim at is the union of all who acknowledge the name of Christ in the Universal Church which is His Body : and that the test of all local schemes of union is that they should express locally the principles of the great Catholic unity of the Body of Christ. Our only desire, therefore, is so to organize the Church in India that it shall give the Indian expression of the spirit, the thought, and the life of the Church Universal.

2. That the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testa-

ments contain all things necessary to salvation and are the rule and ultimate standard of faith.

3. That we accept the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed as containing a sufficient statement of the faith of the Church for a basis of fellowship.

4. That the two sacraments, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, are to be ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordained by Him.

5. A. That believing that the principle of the historic episcopate in a constitutional form is that which is more likely than any other to promote and preserve the unity of the Church, we accept it as a basis of unity without raising other questions about episcopacy.

B. That by a historic and constitutional episcopate we mean :

(a) that the bishops be elected by representatives of the diocese and approved by representatives of the province ;

(b) that the bishops shall perform their duties constitutionally in accordance with such customs of the Church as shall be defined in a written constitution ; and

(c) that continuity with the historic episcopate be effectively maintained, it being understood that no particular interpretation of the fact of the historic episcopate be demanded.

6. That after union all future ordinations to the presbyterate (ministry) would be performed by laying on of hands of the bishops and presbyters (ministers), and

that all consecrations of bishops would be performed by bishops, not less than three taking part in each consecration.¹

7. (a) that the Church in India ought to be independent of the state :

(b) that the Church in India must be free from any control, legal or otherwise, of any Church or Society outside of India :

(c) that while the Church in India is free from such

¹ See note added in Second Preliminary Report III, p. 294.

control it would regulate its acts by the necessity of maintaining fellowship with other branches of the Catholic Church with which we are now in communion.

II. We place on record

That both in the Anglican Church and in the South India United Church ordination is held to convey a commission to minister in the Universal Church of God and not simply in a local area or a particular community,

That in ordination God speaks through the Church and gives special grace for the ministry.

III. In addition to the matters on which agreement was recorded, the S.I.U.C. representatives placed on record statements on equality of the ministry, equality of membership, and communion with other evangelical Churches as follows :

I. EQUALITY OF MINISTRY

The S.I.U.C. requires in ordination :

(a) the resolution of a Church Council, after examination of the candidate and evidence of his inward call ;

(b) the acceptance of the candidate by the Council (presbytery) by the giving of the right hand of fellowship by a chosen minister (presbyter) ;

(c) The prayer for the Holy Spirit and the laying on of hands of the ministers (presbyters).

The commission given in ordination is a commission

(1) to pastoral work and oversight of the Church ;

(2) to teach ;

(3) to administer sacraments.

The S.I.U.C. maintains the principle of confining the administration of the communion and ordination to ministers (presbyters) alone.

The S.I.U.C., therefore, makes it a condition of union that all its present ministers (presbyters) shall after union be recognized as ministers (presbyters) without re-ordination.

2. EQUALITY OF MEMBERSHIP

The S.I.U.C. representatives do not at present pronounce on the question of confirmation which they have not considered. Their Church at present maintains a system of instruction and admission to communion in each parish by a service which includes an examination, profession of faith and prayer for the blessing of the Holy Spirit (and, in one Council, the laying on of hands by the minister).

Without pronouncing in regard to any future adoption of confirmation, the S.I.U.C. desires that all the present communicant members of both Churches should after the union be regarded as communicant members of the Church.

3. COMMUNION WITH OTHER EVANGELICAL CHURCHES

The S.I.U.C. is not prepared to give up the privilege of intercommunion with the other Evangelical Churches with which it is now in communion.

On the question of the admission of ministers of other bodies to celebrate the sacraments in the Church, the S.I.U.C. representatives are not prepared to make a definite statement and reserve the subject for future consideration.

V. S. DORNAKAL, <i>Chairman</i> ,	
JOHN J. BANNINGA,	
E. H. M. WALLER, Bishop in	} <i>Joint</i> <i>Secretaries.</i>
Tinnevelly, Ramnad, and	
Madura.	

Bangalore, March 19, 1920.

76. *Second Preliminary Report*

Of the Special Sub-Committee appointed by the Episcopal Synod of India and Ceylon, and of the Committee appointed by the South India United Church to consider proposals for union with other churches.

[The Lambeth Conference 1920 had been held between the publication of the First and Second Preliminary Reports.]

Bangalore, December 1920

I. A STATEMENT OF SUBJECTS DISCUSSED

The following subjects were discussed during the course of the sessions of the conference.

1. Equality of Ministry.
2. Communion with Other Evangelical Churches.
3. Freedom from State Control.
4. The Area affected by the Union.
5. The Retention of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds.
6. The Governing Body of the Church.

The following resolutions were most carefully considered, discussed, and passed.

II. NOTE ON CONFINING THE NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING UNION WITH THE SOUTH INDIA UNITED CHURCH TO THE DIOCESES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN SOUTH INDIA

In the course of the discussion it became evident that in the initial stages the inclusion of all the Anglican dioceses in India in the proposed corporate union would add immensely to the difficulties of the negotiations.

1. Practical Difficulties. The intention of both parties in the negotiations is that the resultant Church shall be independent and autonomous and free from state control. This involves negotiations for severing the Anglican Church

from state control. That Church is working on this problem, quite apart from the negotiations with the S.I.U.C., but the legal difficulties involved will take a long time to solve and the corporate union of the Churches would be indefinitely postponed.

2. On general grounds the proposed arrangement has advantages. The ecclesiastical questions involved and the reasons for meeting them in the way suggested are being carefully discussed in South India by the Churches concerned. The membership of these Churches is preponderantly Indian. In the Northern dioceses a very large proportion of the members is European and not directly affected by the problems and hopes which influence the Churches in S. India. Moreover the Churches concerned are linked together by language and race and form a natural regional Church.

It thus becomes evident that the best way of working out the practical problems and their adjustments is that they be entrusted to those who are linked together closely by race and language and in a smaller area where continuous consultation is possible.

Another consideration weighs with the Anglican members of the conference. It is apparent that it immensely increases the difficulty of a situation like the present if every decision involving an ecclesiastical issue must be submitted to the judgement of a large number of persons imperfectly acquainted with the circumstances. While not being willing, perhaps, to give their definite consent to each proposition, they would be willing to entrust the working out of the principles laid down to the judgement of the local Bishops guided by the resolutions of the Lambeth Conference and feel secure that nothing would be done by them to break the fellowship of the Churches.

III. NOTE ADDED TO I. (6) OF THE FIRST PRELIMINARY REPORT¹

Persons consecrated Bishops or ordained Presbyters as contemplated in I. (6) of the findings of March 1920, will have all the rights and privileges of Bishops and Presbyters respectively in the Churches now in communion with the Church of England.

IV. THE MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH AFTER UNION

After long discussion and several verbal changes in the original draft, the following resolution was adopted (one member not voting).

Arrangements will be necessary with regard to those ministers of the uniting Churches who were ordained before the union and are working in either Church at the time of union. In the sections which follow 'the area affected by the union' means the dioceses in South India which will be formed to include the members of the two uniting Churches.

The Conference suggests that these arrangements be as follows :

1. All such ministers shall be equally eligible as members of all Councils in the Church in the area affected by the union and as delegates to any Council to which the Church in that area sends delegates.
2. Any such minister shall be at liberty to ask of the bishops of the Church in the area affected by the union a fresh commission such as would have enabled him to minister in the Church to which he did not belong before the union.
3. All ministers working in either Church at the time of

¹ See p. 289.

union together with those subsequently ordained in the Church after union shall form the ministry of the Church in the said area.

4. In regard to ministrations in the area affected, the authorities of the Church in that area will undertake that any minister ordained before the union, who does not avail himself of the liberty mentioned in paragraph 2 above, shall not exercise his ministry, whether permanent or occasional, in places where in their judgement the exercise of his ministry will raise conscientious scruples in the congregation concerned or be injurious to the interests of the Church in the area.

5. Any minister, who does not avail himself of the liberty mentioned in paragraph 2 above, will have no claim by virtue of the union to any rights or status outside the said area which did not belong to him before the union.

V. RESOLUTION TO CONTINUE NEGOTIATIONS

This Conference suggests that its work should be continued and that its next task be the drawing up of a preliminary statement of the guiding principles of such a union between the S.I.U.C. and the Church of England in S. India, especially with regard to points to which special importance is attached in either Church.

The two Conveners of the respective sub-committees (the Bishop of Dornakal and Dr. Banninga) were appointed a committee to make arrangements for the next meeting, to prepare the agenda for that meeting and to arrange for the drafting of Memoranda on the subjects to be discussed.

V. SANTIAGO, <i>Chairman</i> ,	} <i>Joint</i> <i>Secretaries.</i>
E. H. M. WALLER, Bishop in Tinnevely, Ramnad, and	
Madura,	
JOHN J. BANNINGA.	

77. Resolution of the Third Meeting of the Committees of the Anglican and S.I.U. Church on the Union of Churches in South India

Madras, June 1921

I. GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED CHURCH

The memorandum prepared by the sub-committee was presented and the following points were agreed to.

1. SIZE OF DIOCESES

The Conference consider that the aim should be to establish Dioceses smaller than the present Anglican Dioceses and that the division of Dioceses should, as far as possible, be on a territorial basis. As the membership of the united Churches is about equal it would be advisable that in the beginning the number of Dioceses in each of the two uniting Churches should be as nearly equal as possible.

2. THE GOVERNING BODIES

It was agreed that the present Council system, with such local modifications as the circumstances of the Diocese demand, should be adopted :

1. The Pastorate Committees.

2. *The Local Council* : This is variously called 'Circle' and 'District' in the Anglican Church.

3. *The Diocesan Council*. The present 'Church Council' of the S.I.U.C. would be generally in size and constitution the basis of the Diocesan Council.

4. *The Provincial Synod* (or General Assembly).

A. DUTIES AND MEMBERSHIP OF THE PASTORATE COMMITTEE AND LOCAL COUNCILS.

It was agreed that the present scheme of Pastorate Committees and Local Councils should be continued and that in

the united Church each Diocese should be at liberty to draft its own rules for these, subject to the final approval of the Provincial Synod (General Assembly).

B. THE DIOCESAN COUNCIL.

Membership. It was agreed that

(a) this Council should consist of the Bishop: all the clergy (ministers): and lay representatives chosen on a definite proportional basis.

(b) it should also include co-opted members.

(c) the Bishop should be chairman *ex officio*.

C. DUTIES OF THE DIOCESAN COUNCIL.

It was agreed that the duties of the Diocesan Council should be those at present assigned to the ' Church Councils ' of the S.I.U.C., viz :

(a) Oversight and care of the congregations within the Diocese.

(b) Organization and recognition of pastorate and local councils.

(c) Approval of candidates for ordination and the appointment of clergy (ministers) to pastorates (see *Note*).

(d) Counselling and aiding unorganized companies of believers.

(e) Decision on reference and appeals.

(f) Encouragement and maintenance of evangelistic work.

(g) Discipline of the Church according to the constitution.

(h) Election of representatives to the Provincial Synod (General Assembly).

Note. Each Diocesan Council would be free to adopt its own rules for the appointment and transfer of clergy (ministers).

3. POWERS OF THE BISHOP

1. *The Bishop shall be President* of the Diocesan Council and have a right to visit any permanent committees and councils in the Diocese.

2. *Location of clergy* shall be carried out by the Bishop in accordance with the rules formulated by the Diocese. It is highly desirable that the Bishop should conduct or arrange for the conduct of the service at which the minister is inducted to his charge.

3. *Ordinations.* The Diocesan Council will approve and communicate to the Bishop the names of candidates selected for Ordination, in accordance with the rules formulated by each Diocesan Council.

The Bishop will inquire concerning their fitness and if he approve them he will ordain them in the form prescribed. If he does not approve of a candidate he will inform the Diocesan Council of the fact and they may at their discretion take steps to inquire further into the fitness of the candidate; but the Bishop cannot be compelled to ordain a man whom after careful inquiry he does not approve as fit.

4. *The spiritual care of ministers and workers* would be the Bishop's special responsibility.

5. *Licences to officiate and preach.* In accordance with rules laid down by the Provincial Synod the Bishop would give formal licences to clergy to officiate and preach in the Diocese.

6. *Discipline of Church members.* The facts of cases requiring discipline should be tried by courts authorized to do so by the Provincial Synod. Any sentence which involves excommunication, greater or less, will require the approval of the Bishop.

7. *Discipline of Clergy.* Charges against the clergy will be submitted to the Bishop in the first instance and he will proceed to deal with each case in accordance with rules to be formulated by the Provincial Synod.

8. *Veto.* As chairman of the Diocesan Council he would have a veto on resolutions concerning certain classes of subjects prescribed by the constitution. This veto could be the subject of appeal to the Provincial Synod, whose decision would be final.

9. *Finance.* The Bishop would not have control over finance or any arbitrary powers not conferred by the constitution.

10. *Worship.* While the utmost freedom should be allowed in public worship it will be the duty of the Bishop to advise the Churches in this matter and to cause to be prepared special services and prayers as they may be required from time to time. He should also be empowered to take notice of any grave irregularities if they should occur in public worship. It will be of great benefit to the Churches if the Bishop receive reports from them as to the usefulness of different services. (See Appendix I.)

4. VOTING BY HOUSES

of laity, clergy and Bishops in the Provincial Synod.

The Conference considered the question of voting by 'house' in the Provincial Synod and relegated the matter to the consideration and report of a sub-committee to be nominated by the two conveners.

(NOTE BY SECRETARIES: Several other matters were raised in the Report of the sub-committee which were not considered by the Conference for want of time.)

II. CREEDS: THEIR USE: DECLARATION OF · ASSENT

1. In accepting the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds as a sufficient statement of the faith of the Church for a basis of fellowship, it is understood that it is competent to the Church after union to issue supplementary statements

concerning the Faith for the guidance of its teachers and the edification of the faithful, provided that such statements be not contrary to the truths of our religion revealed in the Holy Scripture.

2. That either the Apostles' Creed or the Nicene Creed should be used as the basis of one part of the instruction for Baptism, it being understood that at first the Apostles' Creed will be so used. The present custom in the two Churches is that—in the Anglican Church the Creed is used as prescribed in the Prayer Book and the candidates are asked in the baptismal service to affirm their belief in its terms: and in the S.I.U.C. it is frequently used in the service and questions are asked of the candidates dealing with their faith.

3. The use of the Creeds in worship is an act of adoration and thanksgiving towards Almighty God for his nature and for His acts of love and mercy as well as a joyful remembrance of the faith which binds together the worshippers. While it is competent for the Church to legislate concerning the occasions on which the Creeds are to be used in worship, it is agreed that neither the General Assembly or Synod nor the Diocesan Council nor any other Church authority will forbid their use in worship.

4. Declaration of Assent.

(Preliminary Statement. It ought to be observed first that individuals share the belief of the Church in proportion to their capacity and experience. No two persons say any Creed with precisely the same understanding. One may accept it as a whole as capable of being proved 'by most sure warrants of Holy Scripture' and as being the faith of the Church Universal throughout the ages. Some portions of the Creed he accepts in quite a different way, as having deeply influenced his own life and entered into the very heart of his thinking and feeling. With his growth in religion more and more of the Creed becomes part of his

personal religious experience. But it is equally possible for him to give a conscientious assent to the clauses of the Creed either because they have entered into his religious life, or into the religious life of the Church, or simply because he believes them warranted by Holy Scripture. When clergy or others make a formal declaration of assent to the Creed this should imply at least one of these three positions towards all its clauses. It is no business of the Church to inquire curiously into the individual's state of mind on each clause. By assent the Church means real assent and real assent may take any of the above-mentioned three forms.)

The General Assembly or Synod of the Church shall determine what profession of faith shall be required of persons seeking to be ordained by its Bishops, it being understood that in making the union both Churches agree that at least a sincere belief in the truths enunciated in the Nicene Creed will be required.

5. By the expression ' Nicene Creed ' is meant that Creed which is commonly so called, though it is not the Creed of the Council of Nicaea but the Creed of the Council of Constantinople, and is known to scholars as the Constantinopolitan Creed.

6. It is desirable in making the union to provide that the act or agreement of union shall not be invalidated if in the future the church should return to the original form of the Constantinopolitan Creed by omitting the words 'And the Son ' from the Article on the Holy Spirit.

III. CONFIRMATION

Confirmation as it is understood in the Anglican Church may be administered by any of the Bishops of the united Church in any congregation which desires it. Persons who have been thus confirmed will be admitted to Holy Communion throughout the Church.

In other cases the service of admission to full membership

now in use in the S.I.U.C. or some similar service shall be employed and persons who have been admitted according to this method will be admitted to Holy Communion throughout the Church.

IV. FREEDOM OF WORSHIP

Resolved that the Conference generally approve of the Report on Freedom of Worship and direct that it be printed as an appendix to their report. (See Appendix I, p. 304.)

V. MARRIAGE QUESTIONS

It is understood that the rules now in vogue in the Dioceses and councils which will be included in the united Church shall continue after union till the Provincial Synod of the Church shall determine otherwise.

VI. INTERCOMMUNION ¹

1. It is not intended that the consummation of union between these two Churches should have the effect of excluding from Communion in the Church after the union such persons as have formerly enjoyed the privilege of receiving communion in one of the uniting Churches. In order to secure some equality of treatment in different parts of the united Church general rules will have to be framed by the Provincial Synod or General Assembly which the Diocesan authorities will apply to individual cases.

2. Again it is not intended that the consummation of Union between the Churches should have the effect of laying open to excommunication or other church discipline a member of the future united Church who receives communion from some other Church in a place where no Church services are conducted by the united Church or who, in places where the united Church is working, receives com-

¹ But see p. 315 [*Editor*].

munion on special occasions in other Churches, provided that in either case the Church to which the said member of the united Church goes for communion is one with which before the union members of either of the uniting Churches were accustomed to communicate.

VII. THE MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH

The Conference considered the interpretation of the resolution passed at the first session that 'after union all ordinations shall be by Bishops' in relation to the position of ordained ministers who might, after the union, offer to enter the ministry of the Church as ordained ministers without desiring further ordination in the united Church and in relation to the missionary societies and the Churches which support them ; but as the days allotted for the Conference had passed it was

Resolved that the Conference dissolve and appoint a sub-committee to consider the subject further and report to the next meeting.

The sub-committee is to be nominated by the two Conveners, the Bishop of Dornakal and Dr. Banninga.

It was further

Resolved that the paper prepared on

THE DIACONATE

be printed as an appendix to the report under the title of 'a paper prepared for the Conference but not considered at this session for want of time.'

(See Appendix II, p. 307.)

[V. S. DORNAKAL, <i>Chairman</i> , JOHN J. BANNINGA, E. H. M. WALLER, Bishop in Tinnevelly, Ramnad, and Madura,]	} <i>Joint Secretaries.</i>
--	---------------------------------

APPENDIX I

FREEDOM OF WORSHIP

The principle is now generally recognized that uniting Churches must aim at conserving, for the common benefit, whatever of good has been gained by each body in its separate history. That involves that the future Church will enjoy the freedom of worship which has characterized the S.I.U.C. while also having available for its use the historic liturgies which the Anglican Church desires to carry forward either in their existing or in some modified form into the worship of the future. It follows that

(a) The united Church should refuse to fetter any congregation to a particular form of worship.

(b) At the same time it should look towards the gradual preparation of some service book or Directory of Worship which would embody everything in the Book of Common Prayer which Anglicans find to be helpful for modern worship in India, also all of the S.I.U.C. Directory of Worship which is felt to be of permanent value, together with such forms of worship as Indian Christianity under the Holy Spirit's guidance may devise in the future.

Consider the two principles separately.

(a) The principle of congregational liberty of worship must be laid down as one of the terms of union. On the side of the S.I.U.C. many Christians would be conscientiously unable to enter a union in which it was not recognized. On the Anglican side large numbers feel that their Church has suffered for centuries from a mistaken effort to enforce uniformity. It must therefore not be possible, in the united Church, for any Council or Bishop to impose upon a congregation a form of worship to which it objects, or to prohibit the use of a form of worship which the congregation has found helpful.

The only limitation to the principle of congregational liberty which need be recognized is in the case of the sacraments, where for the sake of fellowship and real unity a minimum of uniformity in observance seems to be necessary and as a matter of fact is actually in existence at present. In baptizing, all ministers of the Churches which propose union use some formula such as 'I baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost'. In the celebration of the Lord's Supper all use the words of institution as recorded in 1 Cor. xi. and incorporated in the Anglican Prayer of Consecration. The use of these words is a guarantee that the sacraments are essentially the same as they have always been in the history of the Church Catholic, and may therefore be laid down as a binding rule for the united Church.

(b) The principle of congregational liberty in worship in no way conflicts with the desire for the gradual compilation of a comprehensive Prayer Book. The use of such a book would be voluntary, but it would serve as a guide and stimulus to the devotional life of the congregations, it would probably be widely enough used for it to become familiar to all parts of the Church, so serving as a bond of union, and it would be of use in great gatherings in which all sections of the Church would unite.

But it appears that the time for the preparation of such a book has not yet arrived. While there is much criticism of existing forms of worship in all Indian Churches, it cannot be said that much definite guidance has hitherto emerged as to the methods of worship which will ultimately be adopted when Christianity has become completely naturalized in India. It appears that no book prepared in the near future could expect to attract to itself the spontaneous love and reverent use without which any Prayer Book is valueless. On the other hand, supposing that some orders of service or forms of prayer in the proposed book were generally adopted

at this stage, it is quite likely that these would very soon acquire, in the minds of their users, a binding force never contemplated by their introducers, and so become an obstacle to the free production of forms which will be as Indian as they are truly Christian and Catholic.

For these reasons it seems wiser to postpone the preparation of a Prayer Book while at the same time noting it as a task to be undertaken as soon as there is reason to believe that it can be accomplished with real benefit to the whole Church.

The suggestion has been made that in one case, that of the Eucharist, it would be of great value if the uniform elements in the worship could extend to a good deal more than the use of the Biblical words of institution, and could include such prayers as express the ideas and sentiments which are fundamental to a true Communion service. The value of such a common nucleus of worship at the Lord's Table is unquestionable, yet it seems doubtful whether at this stage such a nucleus can be prepared without causing offence to some Christians who hold firmly to non-liturgical forms of worship, and it seems better to postpone the preparation of even so small a prescribed order of service until it is asked for by all parts of the united Church.

For the present therefore it seems best that the Anglican and S.I.U.C. usages should continue. When union is effected there will be an inevitable tendency for these usages to approximate to each other, and it will probably come to pass quite naturally in the course of time, that what is of permanent value in them all will be gathered up into a book suitable for use by the whole Indian Church. At the same time there will always be some congregations which prefer to have no fixed forms of worship, beyond those already referred to—the use of the Baptismal Formula and the words of Institution of the Lord's Supper.

APPENDIX II

THE DIACONATE. PRELIMINARY REPORT

(NOTE. This report was circulated to the Conference but not discussed for want of time. It was then ordered that it should be printed as an appendix for information.)

To many minds it is of great importance to make clear that in all we do and attempt our purpose is to continue in this country and in our time the one Church which has always existed. This position gives special value to institutions which are referred to in the Scripture as existing in Apostolic times and have been continued ever since. One of such institutions is the Diaconate. The functions of persons called by the name Deacon have varied in the course of time. At first they seem to have been charged with works of help and mercy, especially the care of the poor and the sick together with the financial work involved. Later on, in the West the Deacons became also assistants of the priests in the Church services and other spiritual matters. Work of this nature gradually overshadowed the other work. It is a result of the development that at the present day the Deacons in the Church of England are practically probationers for the priesthood. The Anglicans coming into the United Church would desire the continuance of the office of Deacon. This would involve Deacons being ordained to remain Deacons for life or till promotion to a higher ministry. Anglicans are prepared to consider proposals for a conception of the duties of a Deacon different from that which now exists in the English Church. For instance, Deacons might be ordained chiefly for the works of mercy and succour and such things as the Apostles described as 'the serving of tables'. If this change were made, the advantages now felt to attach to the Anglican conception of the Diaconate might be conserved by some such

arrangement as follows. If the Church Assembly should resolve to commend a Deacon for ordination to the Presbyterate, that Deacon might become a Deacon candidate and would then be authorized to perform the same sort of work as the Anglican Deacons now perform.

It would be in accordance with a custom which has prevailed in the Church for more than a thousand years, if all persons were required to pass through the Diaconate before being ordained to the Presbyterate. In view of ancient history it cannot be said that this is essential to the validity of the higher order of ministry. But one of the questions which needs determining is whether it should be required as necessary or not that in the future united Church candidates for the Presbyterate should have served the Diaconate.

It is desired that the S.I.U.C. members should consider whether there are any classes of functions which experience has shown to be required by the Church and which could usefully be entrusted to Deacons as an order of the ministry.

If the S.I.U.C. recognizes the value of the functions which have at different times been given to the Diaconate, it should be possible to come to an agreement, which will be very welcome to the Anglican Church, to continue the use of the Diaconate after the Union.

78. Recommendations adopted by the Eighth General Assembly of the South India United Church

Nagercoil, September 1921

1. That the General Assembly place on record its opinion that the S.I.U.C. should be willing for the sake of doing what it can to forward the cause of Union in Christendom, to accept a Constitutional Episcopacy as defined in its resolution of September 1919 ; and at the same time

That it express its position that the S.I.U.C. cannot enter a union which will cut it off from those Churches with which it is now in full communion. It treasures its present catholicity too highly to take any step that would diminish or destroy the fellowship which it now enjoys with Evangelical Christendom.

2. Your Committee recommends that the General Assembly submit the report of its Committee on Union to the different Church Councils connected with it, and request each of them to appoint a Sub-Committee for the careful study of the details of the report and of the whole question of union. After considering the report of its Sub-Committee, each Council is asked to submit to the General Assembly's Committee on Union a detailed statement of the things in the scheme which they approve and the things they disapprove, together with any further criticisms or suggestions concerning the report. It is further suggested that the Councils place the matter before the local Churches and record the opinion expressed by the Churches, and that the Councils report to the Committee on Union not later than October 1, 1922.

3. Your Committee further recommends that the Assembly appoint a Committee of 15 to continue negotiations with the Anglican Church on the points concerning which findings have not yet been adopted and any other matters that may arise. The Committee is to consist of :

K. T. Paul.	J. M. Kesari.	J. H. Maclean.
P. J. Devasagayam.	V. Santiago.	H. A. Popley.
J. V. Chelliah.	H. Sumitra.	E. H. Lewis.
J. Nicholas.	M. Peter.	S. Nicholson.
Paul Daniel.	T. Narasimham.	J. J. Banninga.

(Convener).

4. Your Committee further recommends that this Committee on Union be instructed to review the findings of the Committee on Union with special reference to the principles

laid down in the First Preliminary Report and also to make a very careful study of all the questions involved in Union with special reference to the principle laid down in Resolution I (1) of that Report, 'that it shall give the Indian expression of the spirit, the thought, and the life of the Church Universal.'

It shall also take definite steps to hold conferences in the various Council areas for the purpose of laying the matter before the Churches and finding out the opinion of the Churches concerning the principles involved.

*79. Resolutions adopted by the Provincial Council
of the Church of the Province of India, Burma and
Ceylon*

January 1922

1. That this Council expresses its thankfulness to Almighty God for the progress which has been made by the Joint Committee on Union with the S.I.U.C., as shown by the interim Report, and, while unable to pronounce finally on a scheme which is not yet complete, requests the Metropolitan to appoint a Committee to continue negotiations with the object of drawing up and presenting to the two Churches a formal statement of the cardinal points on which a scheme of Union should be based.

2. That in the opinion of the Council it is much to be desired that when the formal statement of cardinal points on which a scheme of union should be based has been completed by the Joint Committee, the Metropolitan should ask the Central Consultative Body of the Lambeth Conference whether, in their opinion, the Churches of the Anglican Communion will maintain communion with a Church organized on such principles.

3. That this Council desires to place on record its apprecia-

tion of the work done by the members of the Joint Committee, as shown in the interim Reports published, and expresses its gratitude to them for their devoted labour in the matter referred to them. This Council directs that a copy of this resolution be sent to each member of that Committee representing the Episcopal Synod of the Church of England in India and Ceylon, and the General Assembly of the S.I.U.C.

*80. Resolutions of the Fourth Meeting of the
Joint Committee on Union of the Anglican and
S.I.U.C. Churches*

Held at Pasumalai, April 4-7, 1923

[In the interval between the General Assembly of the S.I.U.C. September 1921 and the fourth meeting of the Joint Committee, Resolutions had been adopted by the various Church Councils of the S.I.U.C. with regard to the General Assembly Resolutions.]

**I. REVISED RESOLUTIONS CONCERNING THE
MINISTRY OF THE UNITED CHURCH**

1. The Resolutions of the General Assembly and the various Councils of the South India United Church reveal a very strong dissatisfaction with the proposals of the Joint Committee on Equality of Ministry (IV. of the Second Preliminary Report). The continuance of what was virtually a dual ministry in the united Church, with the limitations which it imposed upon non-episcopally ordained ministers, seemed to militate against the attainment of that real unity for which alone it seems worth while to make the readjustments and the sacrifices which are involved in any union. Accordingly the Committee were led to a proposal which they had at first rejected, viz., a mutual commissioning of ministers. This proposal had been powerfully advocated by Professor V. Bartlet (whose letter is appended to this

report). He urges that not only does this proposal bridge an awkward gap temporarily but that it effects the purpose which all desire of including in the commission of ministers elements which may be considered to be lacking on one side or the other. The Committee is encouraged to hope that this proposal will not be unacceptable as the Anglican Bishops at Lambeth declared themselves to be willing to receive such a commission, while it seems possible to draw up a form of commissioning service which would not be open to the objections previously made to such services from the side of the S.I.U.C.

The Joint Committee therefore

Resolved that the suggestion should be laid before the Churches that there should be a form of commissioning which should be so framed as to be acceptable to practically all the ministers in our two Churches. We find that a commissioning service is advocated by individuals and groups of people in various parts of the world, and we believe it is quite possible that the results of their deliberations and ours may lead us to an agreement on the subject.

The ministers of both Churches would take part in such a service. It would be prefaced by a statement that there was no repudiation of their former ministries, but that it was an act of love and fellowship in which authority was given for the wider ministry of the Word and the Sacraments. It would include the laying on of hands and a prayer for the anointing of the Holy Spirit.

It is proposed that the bishops and the clergy of the Anglican Church be commissioned by certain representative presbyters (ordained ministers) of the South India United Church, and the ministers of the S.I.U.C. by a bishop and certain representative presbyters (members of the order of priesthood) of the Anglican Church. The words of the prayer would be read by each of these groups, and they would then lay their hands on the heads of those of the

other church who were to be commissioned. This would be the last act of the Churches as separate bodies.

We feel that a commissioning service which included a declaration and form of commissioning, somewhat on the lines of the form given below, would give to the whole ministry of the united Church a character which would preserve the fundamental ideas contained in the ministries of the uniting Churches.

The commissioning service would be one of the series of acts consummating union, and there would be held at the same time the consecration of the new bishops and a great corporate communion service. There would then follow the necessary meetings for completing the organization of the united Church.

*DECLARATION TO BE READ BY ALL MINISTERS
STANDING*

‘We are gathered together in the presence of God to receive and, on behalf of the Churches which we represent, to give a mutual commission for a wider ministry in the Church of God. We offer thanks to the one Head of the Church for the privilege of the service which He has permitted us all hitherto to render in our several ministries, and for the manifestation of the working of His Spirit through our imperfect means.

‘None of us dare in any way repudiate the ministry which we have received or dishonour the Spirit of God who has called us to His service and has given us strength to perform His work, and nothing which we now say or do is to be interpreted as throwing doubt upon our previous ordination. We are here publicly and formally seeking additional recognition of a new call and a fuller authority for wider service in a united Church, and implore for ourselves God’s grace and strength to fulfil the same. And we believe that He who prayed that His Church might be

one will bestow upon us the spirit of love, which will work mightily for the healing of the divisions in His Body by the united working of one ministry for the extension of His Kingdom.'

*FORM OF COMMISSION TO BE PRONOUNCED BY ONE
OF THOSE APPOINTED TO LAY THEIR HANDS ON THE
HEADS OF THE MINISTERS*

'We pray Thee, O God, to anoint with Thy Holy Spirit these Thy servants that they may faithfully perform the work of a presbyter in Thy Church, and especially in those parts of it which are now entering into closer fellowship in accordance with the prayer of Thy Son that they all may be one. May the grace of Him who in sending forth His Apostles said, "As the Father hath sent me even so send I you", be ever present with them, and may the gift of love now and ever illumine their lives, and may they faithfully preach Thy Word and dispense Thy Sacraments in the larger sphere now opened to them by our union in Thee.'

2. If the above suggestion is approved, the following general rules may be adopted :

(1) All ministers working in either Church at the time of union shall be equally eligible as members of all Councils in the Church in the area affected by the union and as delegates to any Council to which the Church in that area sends delegates.

(2) All ministers working in either Church at the time of union, together with those subsequently ordained or commissioned in the Church, shall form the ministry of the Church in the said area.

(3) In regard to ministrations in the area affected, the authorities of the Church in that area will undertake that any minister ordained before the union, who does not accept the commission, shall not exercise his ministry, whether permanent or occasional, in places where in their judgement

the exercise of his ministry will raise conscientious scruples in the congregation concerned or be injurious to the interests of the Church in the area.

(4) In the case of ordained missionaries sent in future for work within the area of the united Church and in connexion with it, it shall be expected that they are willing to receive a commission from the authorities of the united Church similar in form to that used at the time of the union ; the same shall be expected in the case of any ordained ministers from other churches in India whom the Assembly may decide to admit.

(5) Any minister who does not accept the commission will have no claim by virtue of the union to any rights or status outside the said area which did not belong to him before the union.

II. CONSECRATION OF BISHOPS

Resolved that a sub-committee, to be nominated by the two conveners, consider the questions :

(1) Whether representative ministers of the South India United Church should take part in the laying on of hands at the consecration of the first bishops of the united Church.

(2) Whether at all future consecrations of bishops presbyters should take part in the laying on of hands. (See Prof. Bartlet's letter printed as Appendix A.)

III. INTERCOMMUNION

In view of certain resolutions of Councils of the S.I.U.C. the committee reconsidered the resolutions on Intercommunion (3rd Meeting, No. VI, p. 302) and substituted the following : Resolved

1. That it is not intended that the consummation of union between these two Churches should have the effect of excluding from communion in the united Church such

persons as have formerly enjoyed the privilege of receiving communion in one of the uniting Churches, and therefore the privilege of receiving communion in the united Church shall continue to be extended to members of those Churches which have formerly enjoyed this privilege.

(A list of such Churches will be maintained.)

2. Again while the Church lays stress on the duty of loyalty to the Holy Catholic Church and to the local church to which a member belongs, members of the united Church shall be considered free to receive communion in Churches whose members are free under (1) above to receive it in the united Church in a place where no church services of the united Church are available or, on special occasions, in places where the united Church is working.

3. On the subject of Inter-Celebration the Committee record ¹ the following statement :

In view of the fact that from time to time ministers of sister Churches, which are either sending missionaries or are in a special way connected with the work, visit the congregations of the Churches included in this union, and that in the past such ministers have been asked to celebrate the communion in their churches, and in view, further, of the fact that ministers of the South India United Church have been accustomed occasionally to celebrate the communion in the sister Churches enumerated, and that a refusal to continue these privileges after union would seriously affect the friendly intercourse hitherto maintained by the Churches with their home societies and others, and also would deprive the united Church, after union, of the privilege of trying to bridge the gulf which separates the episcopal and non-episcopal Churches, the South India United Church earnestly

¹ (Note). In view of the inadequacy of the time available for discussion several Anglican members did not see their way to do more than approve of having this statement recorded in the minutes as they desired to make it a matter for study and inquiry.

appeals to the Anglican Church to regard the continuance of this practice as in no way conflicting with the declared intention of the Church to maintain the principles of unity to which they have agreed and intend to adhere. They desire it to be understood that care should be taken not to use this liberty in such a way as to give offence to the conscience of those not accustomed to it, and further that if a minister is invited to celebrate in another church in a place where there is a congregation of the united Church he shall not accept the invitation without the consent of the minister of the latter church.

IV. CREEDS

In view of the fact that some Church Councils of the South India United Church had raised objections to Resolution I (3) of the First Preliminary Report concerning the acceptance of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds with regard to (1) the individual conscience of members of the Church, and (2) their use as a test in the ordination service, a proposal to make a statement defining the degree of acceptance by members and ministers of the Church, and asserting the right to revise the confessional statements of the Church, was made.

Having before it the fundamental principle of membership in the universal Church as well as the necessity, as far as possible, of doing nothing to offend individual consciences, the Joint Committee did not feel able on the proposals at present submitted to consider any revision of that Resolution and the statement on creeds (3rd Report, II Creeds, &c.).

V. MATTERS TABLED

The following matters were brought before the Joint Committee by the South India United Church representatives and were postponed for further consideration :

I. *Powers of the Bishop.* Under 3. Powers of the Bishop

(3rd meeting, p. 298) after the words in paragraph 3, 'inform the Diocesan Council of the fact,' delete what follows and substitute the words, 'and they shall reconsider the question of the candidate's fitness. If a three-fourths vote of the Council is then given in favour of his ordination, he shall be ordained.'

2. *Voting by Houses.* The opinions of the Councils are definitely unfavourable to this form of voting.

VI. PUBLICITY AND FELLOWSHIP

1. *Publicity.* The Committee feels that it is essential to the progress of the movement for union that organized efforts should be made to give publicity to the deliberations and findings of the Joint Committee in order that (1) members of both Churches may be kept informed of the progress of negotiations and (2) that they may be able to study the different points of view concerning the questions that are being discussed.

Therefore it is resolved that the conveners of the Committees be asked to appoint or to arrange for the appointment by their Church of a publicity Secretary on each side.

2. *Fellowship.* We further believe that the growth in fellowship and mutual acquaintance that we so much desire will best be attained through some common task that we undertake, and some common experience that we share, and we therefore ask the conveners to appoint a sub-committee to try to arrange ways and means whereby our ministers and members may be brought closer together.

HARRY MADRAS,¹

JOHN J. BANNINGA.

¹ The Rt. Rev. E. H. M. Waller, formerly Bishop in Tinnevely, became Bishop of Madras in 1923 [*Editor*].

APPENDIX A

LETTER FROM PROF. V. BARTLET

Mansfield College, Oxford,

August 14, 1921.

To

The Rev. J. J. Banninga, M.A., D.D.,

Secretary of the S.I.U.C.

DEAR DR. BANNINGA,

I have read with the greatest interest and a large measure of sympathy the findings of the various Reports included in the printed 'Report of the Joint Committee on Union' which you have been so good as to forward to me, along with the covering letter in which my opinion is asked on the points of difficulty still remaining at issue. That letter seems to state those points with admirable clearness and loyalty to all the essential interests involved. In my comments, then, on the issues of principle yet open, I start from the standpoint there adopted, and shall try to bring to bear principles already laid down by the S.I.U.C., inviting you and your colleagues to reconsider the application of one or more of them in a way going beyond the use thus far made of them in the three Joint Reports themselves. As regards the standpoint, I adopt your formula, 'We don't want to act in isolation', as fundamental and crucial, understanding it to imply that you will do nothing that is not adopted in the interests of catholic or world-wide unity, as well as of local Indian unity and therefore nothing that creates fresh isolation or exclusiveness in the very act of closing up the Christian ranks in South India. And as regards principles laid down by the S.I.U.C. at the very first, when contemplating the desirability of local unity on the basis of a 'constitutional episcopacy', I would recall its enunciation of 'a mutual recognition of the absolute equality of the ministry and of the membership of the uniting

Churches', as being crucial for all cases of doubt and difficulty.

In the spirit, then, of the fullest catholicity, as suggested by the above formula, I beg leave to submit the still outstanding problems to the test of this guiding and governing principle, and to the analogy of the cases in which its control of points of divergence has been allowed on both sides. In particular, and by way of anticipation, I submit that it has been conceded fuller sway in the conditions and privileges of membership according to the usages of the uniting Churches, than in the matter of the ministry, whether regular or occasional, in the united Church, viewed in the light of the usages of its uniting elements. The source and origin of this difference, and of the serious practical difficulty now referred to a sub-committee—as to the indispensability of episcopal ordination in the normal future of the united Church, and what this implies for the Missionary Societies in question—may prove to be the imperfect degree to which your master-principle has been applied hitherto to the ordination of the constitutional bishop himself, in the constitution as thus far outlined in common. It is defect in 'equality', as it seems to me, at this determinative point, which causes the whole scheme to threaten, in your own words, that 'instead of having formed a link between all Free Churches and all Episcopal Churches' the S.I.U.C. 'shall only be swallowed up in the Anglican communion'.

The specific problem you put to us outside India, and to yourselves is, 'In how far should we insist here, in trying to bring about this union' in South India, 'that the door between us and the Free Churches should be kept open?' And you rightly answer it in principle, by saying up to the point where it ceases to be 'but a first step . . . in bringing the whole of divided Christendom closer together' and in keeping with the vision of the Lambeth Appeal. But an unmodified 'Anglican' type of ordination for Bishops

cannot be accepted by non-episcopal branches of the Church throughout the world as the *conditio sine qua non* of intercommunion and some form of organic unity. This is made clear, I think, by the report of the Committee of the English non-episcopal communions on the Lambeth Appeal,¹ and is fairly evident also as regards the probable attitude of American Christianity generally, in the same circles. Yet the type of *ordination for bishops* suggested in the First Preliminary Report, and assumed in all that follows, seems to be *on purely Anglican lines*, viz., by the agency of bishops only, so that quite naturally persons so ordained will be at once recognizable as virtually Anglican Bishops [See III of Second Preliminary Report].

But, equally naturally, such an *unmodified* Anglican Episcopate, as regards the form of ordination, would tend to perpetuate in the eyes of Christendom at large, both episcopal and non-episcopal, the present state of things, in which episcopacy is the chief barrier in principle to wider unity among Reformed Christians, instead of an important means to its effective realization. What is needful, then, is that the principle of 'equality' there in validity or recognition of forms as used and owned of God in the ministry of characteristic Christian grace to men should be applied to the form of episcopal ordination, as well as to the subsequent forms of episcopal oversight (where it is applied). Only so can it be 'historic and constitutional' in the full sense necessary to satisfy the experience alike of the sub-apostolic Church and of modern times, as interpreted in the minds and consciences of non-episcopalians. For from the standpoint, whether of episcopalians or non-episcopalians, the ordination used by the other branch of Christ's Church is defective in form, in that it fails to express adequately one or other aspect of what the act signifies. In the one

¹ See *The Free Churches and the Lambeth Appeal*. No. 41 *supra* [Editor].

case the defect relates to the larger unity and solidarity of the Church, diocesan and ecumenical, in the other to the action of the local unit of the Church over which the Bishop is to exercise his ministerial functions, and the part of which in his commission (corresponding to their choice of him as bishop) should receive expression in the form of his consecration or extended jurisdiction as the case may be. Now the way to remedy these defects in the eyes of the two groups of organized Christians proposing to unite on a basis of mutual recognition and mutual enrichment of corporate life, is not to ignore the defect of the traditional Anglican form of episcopal consecration, as it appears to non-episcopal consciences, by simply perpetuating that form, but to combine in a single rite the forms hitherto distinctive of the ordination of chief pastors in the respective types of Church life. This is *the only way of securing equality of mutual consideration and charity throughout*, from the top to the bottom of the organized order of the united Church.

In so writing I am only drawing out what seems logically implicit in another element in the concordat sketched in I (5) A and B of First Prelim. Report, viz., that while 'continuity with the historic episcopate be effectively maintained', 'no particular interpretation of the fact of the historic episcopate be demanded'. For ministerial equality, between the uniting Churches—an equality in kind, without raising any vain questions as to relative degrees of validity or efficacy—demands that *the chief representatives of both Churches* and of their ministry should *co-operate* in the ordination of those who are to be the chief ministers of the united Church which expresses and continues the characteristic life of each, but henceforth in unity rather than separation. That is, the presbyters of the S.I.U.C., chosen for the purpose of representing that Church and its ministry, should co-operate in the ordination or ministerial commission bestowed on the bishops of the united Church. Such

ordination would in the case of those already Anglican bishops be by the hands of such S.I.U.C. presbyters only, seeing that they already possessed Anglican orders and jurisdiction corresponding thereto. But in the case of S.I.U.C. presbyters raised to the episcopate, and of all future candidates for the episcopate in the already united Church, the ordination would be by bishops and selected presbyters acting jointly, in keeping with the principles of the two constituent Churches, if not of the primitive form of the episcopate to which both claim to trace back their spiritual lineage of principle.

This is what real equality (as laid down in the resolutions of the 1919 Assembly) between the uniting Churches demands. In this way too, the difficulty of 'further ordination' would be resolved, equality being applied all round or reciprocally as between those Churches. There is little doubt too that those desirous of entering the united Church's ministry from outside would also gladly accept the joint or twofold form of conferring ordination or ministerial commission of the new or union type—one more fully catholic and constitutional than any already existing—as that proper to the new union type of Church organization which it is the aim of the uniting Churches to inaugurate for India and ultimately for modern Christendom.

Thus the difficulty which has been felt to arise touching the external relations of the future S. Indian Church—episcopal, presbyterian, and congregational in its balanced union of principles hitherto existing more or less apart—receives its most equitable and catholic or *inclusive* solution through a fresh application of the fundamental principle of equality to the matter of ordination within the united Church itself, or in the very act of union between the component elements. If bishops and presbyters (in the first instance those of the S.I.U.C.) both co-operate in ordinations alike to the episcopate and presbyterate of the united Church,

then there will be such equality of treatment that there will be no room left for ' conscientious scruples ' arising in any congregation of *either line of tradition*, within that Church, as regards the exercise of his ministry by any of the ministers, for none will be likely not to ' avail himself of the liberty ' to receive ' a full commission ' inclusive of the sort which hitherto he had not received.

Such an inclusive method of ordination, I repeat, and it alone, satisfies the preliminary condition that episcopacy, and no particular interpretation of the historic episcopate, be demanded from any one on either side. It, and it only, *can be accepted* without scruple *by those who hold the most different views* embraced within the existing Churches as to the grace of episcopal ordination, in addition to the view held in common as to its practical value in the respect of unity, both local and world-wide, and of historic continuity to that end. For each would be able to feel his own conviction as to the theology of the matter *to be safeguarded by one or other*, if not both, of the Church's organs of ordination, viz., bishops and presbyters. It 'would only be the more negative aspect of the positive conviction, held conscientiously on either side, that would be discountenanced or ignored by the conjoint method of ordination to the episcopate in the united Church in S. India, which only adds something of fullness to the representative character of the rite, as compared with existing usage elsewhere. For no member or congregation of the united Church is entitled, even under the constitution as so far agreed on, to an exclusive view as to the nature of Anglican ordination to the episcopate, as though through it alone grace could be counted on in connexion with the ministry of the Word and Sacraments. Such a view is implicitly discountenanced in the following sections of the Joint Findings :

(a) First Preliminary Report, Section II.

(b) Second Preliminary Report, Section IV. 1, 3 (the

ministry of the Church would not all have episcopal orders, yet would all be 'equally eligible as members of all Councils' which implies like spiritual grace). Compare First Preliminary Report, III. 1. c., the S.I.U.C. condition *re* recognition as ministers which the above seems to meet.

(c) Resolution of the Third Meeting, 'III. Confirmation' where the grace implied in admission to Holy Communion throughout the Church is recognized as safeguarded by the S.I.U.C. 'service of admission to full membership' and not only by 'confirmation' in the Anglican form. (This appears to be a very significant recognition in its bearing on the argument.)

(d) Third Meeting, 'VI. Intercommunion.'

All these passages, as well as the general aspects of the reports when taken together, seem clearly to imply that the grounds for reservation on the Anglican side touching the problem left open for further consideration (Third Meeting VII.) as to the 'Ministry of the Church', can in consistency be only those of church order rather than ministerial grace whether for Word or Sacrament. Were it otherwise the conditions laid down at the end of the section on 'Equality of Ministry' in the First Preliminary Report, III. (1)—where the ministry of ministers (presbyters) is defined to include that of the Sacrament, c (3)—and apparently agreed to in the Second Preliminary Report, IV (compare 'Intercommunion' paragraph 2, on occasional communion in certain non-episcopal churches outside the united Church, with the sacramental implication¹) would in fact not be conceded but evaded at a point most vital for the wider possibilities of unity, for the sake of which the concessions on the S.I.U.C. side are largely being made.

To sum up, then, my considered opinion is that the fulfilment of the condition laid down by the S.I.U.C. from the first; and on the basis of which all later findings have

¹ See p. 302 [*Editor*].

apparently proceeded, ought to be insisted on in spirit and in total effect, as well as in letter (as seems agreed to in paragraph IV of the Second Report); that this bears directly on the reserved cases in paragraph VII of the Third Report; and that the best and most consistent way, in keeping with the general principle of 'absolute equality of the ministry . . . of the uniting Churches', viz., an episcopal and non-episcopal or presbyterial one, would be to reconsider and amend, by an added safeguard on the score of equality, the resolution that 'after union all ordinations shall be by bishops', i. e., bishops *only*, in the case of the 'consecration of bishops'. As argued above, the conjunction of presbyters in this case also, as in ordination of presbyters, would not detract from the significance of the service, considered as an act of Church order, but would rather add to its authority, and this is the only light in which the service can be made binding in a Church uniting the traditions of the Churches in question, as of 'other branches of the Catholic Church' with which they 'are now in communion' and desire so to remain [First Preliminary Report I. 7 (c)].

Here, then, seems to be the simplest and most satisfactory solution of the present difficulty, since *it is one that resolves also the difficulties of the transition period* which are dealt with, and can only be dealt with, in a makeshift way in paragraph IV of the Second Preliminary Report. Nor would the objection be really cogent, that the ordination of bishops and presbyters being in that case by the same joint ministry the distinctiveness of ordination to the episcopate would be sacrificed: for the distinctiveness of the *intention* in the commission, or expressed by *the prayer* for the requisite grace in each case, is the essential matter, and this would be preserved. Should, however, the Anglicans after due pondering of this solution declare it to be unacceptable, then it will be for them to submit what they deem more equitable

means of 'maintaining fellowship with other branches of the catholic Church with which' both 'are now in communion'. This the Joint Conference agreed to be a 'necessity' (First Preliminary Report, I. 7 c.) and yet the present resolution as to episcopal ordination in the united Church tends to put a distinct limitation upon the degree of fellowship (here the interchange of ministry) hitherto enjoyed. Unless this difficulty is removed, either as suggested above or by some other method meeting the scruples of non-episcopal consciences, it is to be feared that in course of time all freedom for ministers of non-episcopal ordination, coming from outside, to exercise their ministry in the Holy Communion (the Sacrament of unity) *even occasionally* will be withdrawn, in spite of the limited sanction for such ministry conceded to existing ministers of the S.I.U.C. within the united Church even if not accepting episcopal ordination (Second Preliminary Report, IV. 4). If so, the South Indian Church would cease to play a *liaison* or linking part in Christendom at large, and *probably make non-episcopal communions all the more shy of proposed unions on the basis of 'a constitutional episcopate'*. All depends here on the kind of 'constitutional episcopate' marking the united Church, making it something really new in its equally inclusive treatment of the principles of ministry distinctive of the uniting Churches. For if 'further ordination', according to the local usage special to that united Church, were necessary to all those who had not received it—alike whether they had already received ordination from bishops of the purely Anglican type (i. e., by Bishops only) or from presbyters only—then there would be no good reason for those already ordained non-episcopally to scruple about accepting, with a view to regular ministry in the South Indian Church, the distinctive form of ordination or commission proper to that branch of the Church Catholic. It would simply be one

framed in the interests of wider future unity throughout the Church at large, so long as that fuller form was not such as to suggest doubt touching the validity of their previous ordination to the Gospel Ministry of Word and Sacraments.

Yours sincerely,

VERNON BARTLET,
Professor of Church History,
Mansfield College, Oxford.

*81. Resolutions adopted by the Ninth General
Assembly of the South India United Church*

Vaddukoddai, Ceylon, August 1923

Commissioning Service. Though not prepared to make a final pronouncement on the question of the Commissioning Service, the General Assembly thinks this service will probably provide a solution of the problem of the equality of the ministry within the united Church, and it submits the resolutions regarding this subject to the various Church Councils with the request that they study them in all their bearings and report their findings concerning the matter to the Committee on Union at as early a date as possible.

Intercommunion. With reference to the principles laid down at Nagercoil regarding fellowship with sister Churches, the General Assembly notes with satisfaction the signs of progress made by the fourth Conference in III, paragraphs (1) and (2). (See p. 315).

The Committee is, however, requested to reconsider the question of the list of Churches with which we are in communion in resolution number (1) and the desirability of omitting the words 'in a place . . . working' from its resolution No. 2.

Intercelebration. The Assembly instructs its committee to continue to seek a solution which will be satisfactory to both bodies and which will be in conformity with the following Resolution passed by the General Assembly in 1921 :

‘ That it express its position that the S.I.U.C. cannot enter a union which will cut it off from those Churches with which it is now in full communion. It treasures its present catholicity too highly to take any step that would diminish or destroy the fellowship which it now enjoys with Evangelical Christendom.’

Resolved that we communicate to the Anglican Church in India through its Committee on Union the action of this General Assembly and express the opinion, that for further progress in these negotiations, it is very highly desirable that we should receive from the authoritative bodies of that Church an expression of opinion regarding the proposals found in the Joint Committee’s Report.

Believing that the aim of our Union negotiations should, under God’s guidance, be the building up of a comprehensive United Church of Christ in South India and Ceylon, the General Assembly instructs its Union Committee to approach such Churches as are believed to be sympathetic with this ideal, with a view to securing their interest and co-operation.

XVI. IRELAND

82. *The Church of Ireland*

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL SYNOD
MAY 10, 1921

That the General Synod of the Church of Ireland welcomes the 'Appeal to all Christian people' issued by the Bishops assembled in the Lambeth Conference, and requests the House of Bishops to give publicity to the Appeal and to initiate conferences with representatives of other Churches on the proposals therein set forth.

83. *Presbyterian Church in Ireland*

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
JUNE 14, 1921

[The conferences indicated in this and the preceding Resolution are continuing.]

That a Committee be appointed to confer with the Committee of the General Synod on the subject of Church Union.

XVII. NEW ZEALAND

84. *The Presbyterian Church of New Zealand*

DELIVERANCE ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
NOVEMBER 16, 1921

First Church, Dunedin,
New Zealand.
16th November 1921.

The Assembly again convened and was constituted.

Inter alia :

The Assembly called for the report of the Committee on the Lambeth Appeal, which was given in by Dr. Cameron, convener, as follows :

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand desire to express their hearty appreciation of the tone and spirit of the 'Appeal to All Christian People from the Bishops assembled in the Lambeth Conference of 1920'. They are in full accord with the Most Reverend Fathers and Brethren of the Great Sister Church of England in deploring the weakness of a divided Christendom, in humbly acknowledging before God their own part in the common guilt of this disunion, and in cherishing the glorious 'vision of a Church, genuinely Catholic, loyal to all Truth, and gathering into its fellowship 'all who profess and call themselves Christians', within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present, shall be possessed in common, and made serviceable to the whole Body of Christ'. They gratefully acknowledge the courage and statesmanship with which the Archbishops and Bishops in Conference assembled

have earnestly and prayerfully sought to find a basis of reunion such as might in their judgement bury the memory of past dissensions and misunderstandings, and enable all the scattered and divided members of the Body of Christ to enter on a new life as parts of one organic whole.

In this Dominion as elsewhere the General Assembly represents the most ancient of the non-Episcopal Churches, and the one whose system of faith and order is most widely diffused throughout the whole world. This Church, moreover, has most resolutely endured the fires of persecution and martyrdom, and its doctrine and polity have stood the test of adaptability to varied circumstances of nationality and history. The General Assembly believe that in this matter, speaking generally, they express the mind of all the non-Episcopal Churches.

It is their profound conviction that the first step towards a reunited Christendom is the creation of an atmosphere of mutual trust and esteem, and an adequate emphasis of the relative importance of the things regarding which all true Christians are already one in sentiment and feeling, as compared with the things which divide them. They are convinced that this can be secured only by full unqualified recognition of one another as members of equal standing in the one great family in heaven and on earth, called by the name of the One Lord and Saviour of all men. They believe, further, that the best practical steps in this direction are co-operation in general social and moral endeavour after the mind and will of Christ, fraternal discussion of one another's respective theological and ecclesiastical positions, the exchange of pulpits, and such friendly intercourse in other respects as that to which they are already accustomed in the relations of the non-Episcopal Churches.

It is with profound regret that the General Assembly must inform the Most Reverend Fathers and Brethren that so far as the Presbyterian Church is concerned, their pro-

posals for mutual recognition and re-ordination remove no obstacle to the reunion of Christendom. Churches of the Presbyterian order have already at various times accepted or even reinstated the 'office of a Bishop exercised in a representative and constitutional manner' so that the Episcopate in itself is not the chief difficulty. But if the Presbyterian Church were to consent to an Act insisted on solely because so many others regard Episcopal ordination as the only channel through which the fullness of Divine Grace is transmitted by Christ to His Church, they would not only stultify their whole past, but, in their view of the fundamentals of the Gospel, obscure the true nature of Divine Grace, and deny the glorious liberty of the sons of God. The former they might conceivably do in the interests of peace, and as their measure of sacrifice for the reunion of Christendom; the latter they could not possibly do, without being false to Him who called the Church into being, and to the cause for which the Church itself exists.

Rev. Dr. Cumming moved, Professor Dickie seconded, and it was agreed,

That the Assembly approve of this deliverance and direct that a copy of it be sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury, also to the Acting Primate of the Anglican Church in New Zealand, with intimation of the willingness of this Church to confer with representatives of the Anglican Church on the question of co-operation between the two Churches such as might pave the way to ultimate union.

Extracted from the records of the General Assembly by—

JAMES H. MACKENZIE
Assembly Clerk.

85. The Church of the Province of New Zealand

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL SYNOD
MAY 1, 1922

That this Synod expresses its thankfulness to Almighty God for the great movement made towards Unity by the Lambeth Conference of 1920, and associates itself with the Resolutions passed by that Conference on this great question. That a copy of the Lambeth Appeal and Resolutions on Reunion be sent to the Leaders of the Christian Churches in New Zealand, and that they (the Churches) be invited to co-operate with us in prayer, study, and conference in view of the ultimate realization of the Lambeth Vision.

XVIII. WALES

86. *The Council of Evangelical Churches of Wales*

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL
DECEMBER 1920

That we rejoice exceedingly in the noble Appeal issued by the Conference at Lambeth and we reciprocate to the full the spirit of Christian fellowship so manifest throughout the proposals, and we share wholeheartedly in the desire that all should unite in a new and great endeavour to recover and to manifest to the world the unity of the Body of Christ for which He prayed, and we further pledge ourselves to that response of love, meditation, and prayer whereby alone the deeper concord of Christ's people with the Master's purpose can find its ultimate expression.

87. *The Welsh Congregational Union*

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE ANNUAL ASSEMBLY
JUNE 1921

That this Assembly of the Welsh Congregational Union in Session at Pentre Rhondda expresses its thankfulness for the increase of brotherly love and understanding between the different sections of the Church of Christ and welcomes every effort to ensure greater religious unity and especially the Appeal and the declaration of the Lambeth Conference. And though the Congregational Churches have been always ready to come into closer union with any branch of the Christian Church on the basis of brotherhood, liberty and

the redemptive principles of the Gospel, the Assembly believes with the Bishops that the time has not yet arrived to create a formal and outward union between the Churches, because it believes that union is impossible on the basis of creed, office, and Sacrament as suggested by the declaration of Lambeth. In the meantime the Assembly believes that the most effective means of cultivating the Spirit of Unity and of preparing the way to a visible Union is for all sections of the Church to lay hold of every opportunity to create good feeling towards one another, and to co-operate practically, as far as possible, in the interests of the Gospel in matters connected with religious instruction and social reforms, and in every way that promotes the principles of the Kingdom of Christ in the World. And the Assembly exhorts all the Congregational Churches to do their share to foster Union in spirit and action.

XIX. THE WEST INDIES

88. *The Church of the Province of the West Indies*

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE SYNOD OF BISHOPS
AUGUST 1922

1. That the Bishops of this Province record their cordial agreement with the main principle of the Appeal put forth by the Bishops assembled in the Lambeth Conference of 1920 to all Christian people on the subject of the Reunion of Christendom.

2. That while in their opinion the time has not yet come for the formation of any definite scheme of reunion with other Christian Bodies, they recommend that, where it has not already been done, private conferences be held with the Leaders of those Bodies with a view to discovering the best methods of approach towards visible union in matters of Faith and Order.

3. That any outcome of such conferences which may appear likely to be of value in the future consideration of any scheme of reunion should be submitted to the Archbishop of the Province and should be brought before the Provincial Synod at its next session.

4. That in those Dioceses of the Province where the conditions render it advisable councils representing all Christian Communions be formed to promote the physical, moral, and social welfare of the people.

XX. REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM

89. *Letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Archbishops and Metropolitans of the Anglican Communion*

LAMBETH PALACE.

Christmas, 1923.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP,

More than three years have passed since the Lambeth Conference of 1920, and I am told on many sides that it would be a good thing that I should send to the Metropolitans of our Communion a brief summary of the position, as I view it, of the Reunion question, which has during these years been astir.

This letter is not in any strict sense official. It is merely a brief summary of what seem to me personally to be the present features of the scene or 'movement' viewed from an advantageous standpoint. You will pardon me if, for the sake of clearness, I go over some very familiar ground.

I. Start from the Lambeth Conference of 1920. Its Report, with special emphasis upon the 'Appeal to All Christian People', to which we had agreed with almost complete unanimity, was, as you know, circulated in many languages and in many lands. The Metropolitans throughout the Anglican Communion have no doubt, in accordance with the request of the Conference, taken steps within their respective areas to confer upon the subject with the local leaders of other churches. Besides this, it was my privilege to send copies officially to the heads of other leading churches throughout the world, and the replies from every quarter, Eastern and Western, and from the English-speaking

Churches and Denominations at home and overseas, were uniformly courteous and were sometimes even eager in their expressions of cordiality and hope.

Much has passed during these years with regard to Reunion, and not all of it bears directly upon the Lambeth 'Appeal', but that 'Appeal' has in all cases formed a background to what has been done and said.

2. I would remind you that here in England, within a few weeks of our transmitting the Appeal to the authorities of the different Free Churches, a series of Conferences began to be held at Lambeth between leaders officially appointed by the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches and a number of English Bishops. I think I am not exaggerating when I say that these Conferences in their composition, their character and their purpose, have no precedent in the history of the Church in these Islands. The Archbishop of York has throughout taken the lead in the discussions, and I cannot sufficiently express the debt owed by the whole Church to the wisdom, determination, and patience with which he has guided the spokesmen on the different sides and assisted them in their efforts to reach agreement in the truth.

You will remember that the first Report of the subjects discussed and agreed upon at these Conferences was issued in May 1922, over the joint signatures of the two Archbishops and the Moderator of the Federal Council. It treated the crucial topics of the Nature of the Church, the Ministry, and the Place of the Creed in a United Church, and was published by S.P.C.K. under the title of *Church Unity*. On the basis of that Report, and with the full co-operation of the Federal Council, further Conferences have taken place during the past twelve months on the 'Status of the Existing Free Church Ministry'. The Anglican members of the Joint Conference, after repeated discussion with the Free Church representatives and with one another, presented a long Memorandum on that subject to the Federal Council,

which in its turn issued last September a statement of the Free Church position, and again expressed the desire that the Conferences should be resumed. The whole of these documents have now been issued in a single pamphlet published by S.P.C.K. under the title, '*Reunion. The Lambeth Conference Report and the Free Churches.*'

In addition to this I myself addressed the Wesleyan Conference at Bristol this year on the subject of Christian Unity; and the Archbishop of York has personally commended the 'Appeal' to the Annual Assemblies of the Baptist Union, the Presbyterian Church of England, and also the Wesleyan Conference. All these Churches, as well as others, have passed Resolutions of general welcome to the 'Appeal'. The Wesleyan Conference has adopted a considered reply of its own.

3. In Scotland the Church of Scotland and the United Free Church of Scotland have been, and are still, engaged on their own union movement, and the time is not yet ripe for the initiation of the formal communications with ourselves, which they have expressed their readiness to take in hand in due course. Meantime I have had the honour, together with the Primus of the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Bishop of Peterborough, of addressing the General Assembly of each Church on the Lambeth Conference Report, and each Church, after consideration in Committee, adopted a careful and friendly response to the 'Appeal'.

It seems to me therefore that we have a right, with thankfulness to Almighty God, to regard the position, in Great Britain itself, as fraught with abundant hope. There can be no question that the leaders upon all sides, and through them the officers, clerical and lay, of the respective Churches are disposed in quite a novel degree to appreciate one another's position and to look forward to a yet nearer approach.

4. From overseas, reports steadily reach Lambeth, sometimes from the Metropolitans themselves, sometimes in other

ways, showing the eager welcome which the 'Appeal to All Christian People' has received both in non-Episcopal and in Episcopal Churches. To remind you of only a few instances: In South India negotiations of a searching kind are in progress between the South India United Church and the Anglican Church. In America, in addition to all the work relating to the proposed World Conference on Faith and Order, the preparations for which are proceeding apace, the Protestant Episcopal Church has shown a remarkable readiness for new openings in its dealings with the members of many European Churches who have come to live in the United States. I have appreciated highly the encouraging news which reaches me from Australia of Conferences at Sydney and at Cronulla between representatives of our own Communion and of the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches. And so I could go on. It seems to me quite clear that in almost every part of the world where the Anglican Communion is found—in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, East Africa, West Africa, and also in Japan, in China, in Egypt, in Palestine, and in many parts of the Continent of Europe—a new spirit of fellowship, a new readiness for understanding and co-operation have been revealed during these eventful years.

5. It will not be forgotten that the Church of Sweden gave a cordial welcome to the Resolutions which the Lambeth Conference adopted with regard to it. In September 1920, the Bishops of Durham and Peterborough, by invitation of the Archbishop of Upsala, took part in the Consecration of two Swedish Bishops in Upsala Cathedral. In April 1922, the Bishops of the Church of Sweden issued a full reply to our Resolutions which was published in the S.P.C.K. magazine *Theology* in July 1922.

6. I pass to the Eastern Orthodox Church and our relations thereto. As you will remember, an important Delegation, officially sent by the Patriarchate of

Constantinople, was welcomed by the Lambeth Conference in 1920 and attended meetings of a special Committee which we appointed for the purpose. On its return to Constantinople the Delegation produced a Report which was officially presented to the Holy Synod and was subsequently printed in *The Christian East* for March 1922. This Report is an important document and raises a number of interesting questions, with some of which our regularly constituted Eastern Churches Committee (appointed at the request of a previous Lambeth Conference) has been invited to deal. Side by side with it a treatise on 'Anglican Ordinations' was published by the late Professor Komnenos,¹ one of the most prominent theologians of the Orthodox Communion, himself a member of the Delegation. In that scholarly treatise the validity of Anglican Orders is clearly upheld. And, as is now well known, in August 1922 the Patriarch and Holy Synod of Constantinople issued an official Declaration on Anglican Ordinations in the form of a letter from the Patriarch Meletios IV to myself. This document states that 'as before the Orthodox Church, the Ordinations of the Anglican Episcopal confession of Bishops, priests and deacons, possess the same validity as those of the Roman, Old Catholic, and Armenian Churches possess, inasmuch as all essentials are found in them which are held indispensable from the orthodox point of view for the recognition of the "Charisma" of the priesthood derived from Apostolic succession.' I communicated the Declaration formally to the Convocation of Canterbury in full Synod last February, and explained fully its meaning and limitations in a speech which was subsequently translated into Greek. The Address in English and Greek is published in pamphlet form. The Constantinople Declaration was shortly afterwards endorsed by the Patriarch of Jerusalem and by the Church of Cyprus.

¹ See *The Christian East*, September 1921.

7. These are not small matters in the contemporary history of the Church of Christ, and you will, I feel sure, pardon me for thus bringing them to your notice or recollection in a consecutive form. A volume is now in the Press under the title *Documents on Christian Unity, 1920-4* (Oxford University Press), which will contain not merely the Reports and papers to which I have here referred, but other information on the subject.

8. In addition to all this there remains the question—a question which has features of paramount importance—of the relation of the Church of England to the Church of Rome. You will agree with me in regarding that subject as separated from other reunion problems, not only by the history of centuries of English life but by present-day claims and utterances. And the plain fact confronts us that in relation to that subject there exist both at home and in the overseas Dominions passions, dormant or awake, which are easily accounted for but which, when once aroused, are difficult to allay. I have myself been repeatedly warned that to touch that subject is unwise. Men urge that 'even if the opportunity be given' it is easier and safer to let it severely alone. That may be true, but you and I are party to the 'Appeal to all Christian People', and I, at least, find it difficult to reconcile that document with an attitude of apathy or sheer timidity as to our touching the Roman Catholic question. Not only are we pledged to the words and spirit of the 'Appeal' itself, but we have before us what was said on the subject by the Committee of the same Lambeth Conference in 1920. We there express our readiness to welcome any friendly discussion between Roman Catholics and Anglicans for which opportunity may be given.¹ I have no right to say that the utterances

¹ The words are as follows: 'Your Committee feels that it is impossible to make any Report on Reunion with Episcopal Churches without some reference to the Church of Rome, even though it has

of the Lambeth Conference have influenced Roman Catholic opinion, but I am certain that they have increased our own responsibilities in the matter. I was accordingly glad when I learned two years ago that a private conference or conversation was about to take place at Malines between Cardinal Mercier, the venerated Archbishop of Malines, and a few Anglicans, who were to meet under his roof, with a view to the discussion of outstanding and familiar barriers between the Church of England and the Church of Rome. Though I had no responsibility for this arrangement, nor even any official knowledge of it, I was courteously informed of the proposed visit and was furnished with the names of those who were to take part in the informal discussion.¹ The substance of the conversation which took place was reported to me both by the Cardinal and by my Anglican friends. It necessarily turned in large part upon the position and claims of the Roman See, or in other words, the Primacy of the Pope. A Memorandum upon that and kindred subjects which had been prepared on behalf of the Anglican group was discussed, and the Lambeth Conference 'Appeal to All Christian People' was, I understand, considered paragraph by paragraph. It was suggested that,

no Resolution to propose upon the subject. We cannot do better than make our own the words of the Report of 1908, which reminds us of "the fact that there can be no fulfilment of the Divine purpose in any scheme of reunion which does not ultimately include the great Latin Church of the West, with which our history has been so closely associated in the past, and to which we are still bound by many ties of common faith and tradition". But we realize that—to continue the quotation—"any advance in this direction is at present barred by difficulties which we have not ourselves created, and which we cannot of ourselves remove." Should, however, the Church of Rome at any time desire to discuss conditions of reunion we shall be ready to welcome such discussions.'

¹ On the Anglican side, Dr. Armitage Robinson, Dean of Wells, Dr. Walter Frere and Lord Halifax; and on the Roman Catholic side, His Eminence the Cardinal, Monsignor van Roey, Vicar General, and the Abbé Portal.

with a view to a second visit, the two English Archbishops might informally nominate delegates and might suggest the outline of discussion to be followed. I did not see my way to doing this, but in the correspondence which ensued I expressed my readiness to have official cognizance of the arrangements, provided that a corresponding cognizance were given by the Vatican. Satisfied, after correspondence, with regard to that point, I gave what was described as friendly cognizance to a second visit of the Anglican group to Malines in March 1923. They again received the kindly hospitality which has been courteously given and gratefully welcomed. The conversation on that occasion turned in part on certain large administrative problems which might arise, if and when a measure of agreement had been reached on the great doctrinal and historical questions sundering the two Churches.

It was agreed that a third Conference should take place. A wish was expressed on both sides that the number of participants should be enlarged, and I took the responsibility of definitely inviting Dr. Charles Gore, late Bishop of Oxford, and Dr. Kidd, Warden of Keble College, Oxford (both of whom had given special attention to the Roman question), to join the Anglican group. This increased my responsibility in the matter, and I found myself in concurrence with His Eminence the Cardinal, as well as with the members of the original group, in pressing the point that prior to any discussion upon the possible administrative questions which might arise, attention should be concentrated upon the great doctrinal and historical issues at stake between the two Churches. Certain memoranda were prepared and circulated,¹ and I had the advantage of personally conferring

¹ To prevent misunderstanding I ought perhaps to explain that Lord Halifax's second pamphlet, entitled *Further Considerations on Behalf of Reunion*, was published independently, to express his personal view on certain points relating to the origin and growth of the Papacy. That view, as their writings show, is not shared by his Anglican companions at Malines.

at Lambeth with the five Anglicans who were to take part in the third Conference, together with a few friends and counsellors of my own whom I had invited to meet them. I have always considered it important that our representatives at Conferences which take place, whether with Free Churchmen, or Orthodox, or Roman Catholics, should remember that, while each individual remains free to express his own opinions, what is in question is not what any individual may think but what the great Anglican body has in the past maintained or is likely to maintain in the future. I found, as I anticipated, that our visitors to Malines were not likely to forget what the historical Anglican position and claims have been in the past, as set forward for example by the great theologians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—a position which we have no thought of changing or weakening to-day. It seemed to me to be fair to the Roman Catholic members of the Malines Conference, now augmented by the addition of Monsignor Batiffol and the Abbé Hemmer, that the firmness and coherence, as we believe, of our Anglican doctrine and system should be unmistakably set forward.

Thus arranged, the third Conference was held at Malines a few weeks ago, under the same kindly hospitality as before. There has not yet been time to weigh adequately the record of the conversations which took place, still less the unsolved differences which they exhibit, but I may say at once that, as was inevitable, the discussions are still in a quite elementary stage, and that no estimate, so far as I judge, can yet be formed as to their ultimate value. Needless to say, there has been no attempt to initiate what may be called 'negotiations' of any sort. The Anglicans who have, with my full encouragement, taken part, are in no sense delegates or representatives of the Church as a whole. I had neither the will nor the right to give them that character. This is well understood on both sides. They have sought merely

to effect some re-statement of controverted questions, and some elucidation of perplexities. And to me it seems indubitable that good must in the Providence of God ensue from the mere fact that men possessing such peculiar qualifications for the task should, in an atmosphere of goodwill on either side, have held quiet and unrestrained converse with a group of Roman Catholic theologians similarly equipped. No further plans are yet prepared, but it is impossible, I think, to doubt that further conversations must follow from the careful talks already held. At the least we have endeavoured in this direction, as in others, to give effect to the formal recommendation of the Lambeth Conference that we should 'invite the authorities of other Churches to confer with [us] concerning the possibility of taking definite steps to co-operate in a common endeavour . . . to restore the unity of the Church of Christ'.

I have stated all this somewhat fully, though there is, of course, a great deal more which might be said. Indeed, I hope myself before long to have an opportunity in Convocation¹ or elsewhere of speaking further upon the subject. From the nature of the case the proceedings have of necessity been private. To attempt them publicly would have been obviously futile. For what has been done I am bound to accept full personal responsibility. I have not thought it right, or indeed, practicable, to involve others in that responsibility, though I have confidentially informed all our Diocesan Bishops, and especially the Archbishop of York, of every step that has been taken. The difficulties are immense. You know them as clearly as I do. They may prove to be, for some time to come, insuperable. Paul may plant and Apollos water, it is God who giveth the increase.

¹ The Archbishop of Canterbury made a full statement in the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation on February 6, 1924 (see *Chronicle of Convocation* February 1924). [Editor.]

9. In this letter, my dear Brother, I have recounted facts and endeavours with some of which you are, I am glad to know, familiar. With all that is astir in the world to-day, there may be some—you I am sure are not among them—who think that we are devoting too much time and effort to questions of reunion within the Church of Christ.

To us it seems certain that upon the Church of Christ must rest a chief responsibility for every forward step that can be taken towards the healing and the bettering of a distracted world. If the Church is to fulfil such a function in the world, its effort is infinitely weakened so long as it is obliged to go forward in scattered and independent detachments, and not as one body. It is in simple and whole-hearted reliance upon the guidance of God the Holy Spirit that we are emboldened to nourish hope and to shape resolve. The vision which our Lord, as we believe, has set before us points the road to reunion. The road may not be short, but we believe it will be sure.

I remain, as always,

My dear Archbishop,

Your faithful brother and servant in our Lord Jesus Christ,

RANDALL CANTUAR:

XXI. THE CONVERSATIONS AT MALINES

90. *Letter from Cardinal Mercier to his Clergy*

LES « CONVERSATIONS DE MALINES »

Lettre de S. E. le Card. D. J. MERCIER à son Clergé.

Malines, le 18 janvier 1924

Fête de la Chaire de saint Pierre à Rome

CHERS CONFRÈRES ET DÉVOUÉS COLLABORATEURS,

Voilà deux années, et davantage, que je suis en relations intimes avec quelques personnalités du monde Anglican auxquelles je porte une estime profonde et une affection sincère. Nous nous sommes rencontrés plusieurs fois ; nous avons échangé avec elles des correspondances au sujet de ce que nous avons le plus ardemment à cœur, les intérêts de l'Église Catholique notre Mère.

Il ne nous serait pas venu à la pensée de vous mettre au courant de ces relations, pour la raison fort simple que leur objet est, de sa nature, confidentiel et que nous nous sommes engagés, au surplus, de part et d'autre, à n'en rien livrer au public sans un accord préalable.

Cet accord a été gardé. L'Archevêque de Cantorbéry n'a rien révélé de ce qui forma le thème de nos conversations et de leurs conclusions, mais il a jugé l'heure venue pour lui de fixer ses coreligionnaires sur l'attitude qu'il avait prise à l'égard de nos conférences. C'était, de sa part, un acte de loyauté auquel nous accordâmes, d'ailleurs, notre plein acquiescement. C'était aussi un acte de courage, car, étant donné l'état d'esprit, déclaré ou sourd, très répandu encore dans les milieux Anglais non catholiques, et que l'on désigne souvent d'un mot, « l'anti-papisme », il était aisé de prévoir qu'un témoignage de

déférence, ne fût-il qu'implicite et indirect, à un évêque, à un Cardinal de l'Église de Rome, attirerait à son auteur autre chose que des sympathies et des compliments.

Dans une Lettre datée de Noël 1923, adressée aux archevêques et aux métropolitains de la communion anglicane, le Dr. Randøll Davidson, archevêque de Cantorbéry, fait allusion aux « Conversations de Malines » et déclare que, sans y avoir officiellement engagé son autorité, il ne les a pas ignorées, y a pris intérêt, et en espère des résultats heureux.

Les milieux protestants et un certain nombre de catholiques s'émurent fort de cette révélation. Pendant plusieurs semaines, les journaux et les revues y ont vu un thème à vives controverses, dont l'écho a passé la Manche ; le désir du public d'avoir chaque matin des nouvelles à sensations, l'ardeur des journalistes à lui en fournir qui allassent crescendo, crèrent autour de nos paisibles réunions de Malines une atmosphère d'agitation factice, à laquelle il est de mon devoir de les soustraire.

Je vous dirai les faits, à l'effet de les rétablir dans la simplicité de leur vérité.

Je vous en fournirai les raisons déterminantes.

Et, puisque l'occasion heureusem'en est offerte, j'essaierai d'en tirer, Chers Confrères, pour vous et pour nous un enseignement qui fait loi dans le ministère pastoral.

I

Les Faits.

Les autorités religieuses, les hommes d'ordre attentifs à l'évolution des idées et des événements, s'effraient de la déchristianisation des masses et de la rapidité avec laquelle la disparition de la Foi au surnaturel mène à la négation de toute religion. Le phénomène est général, mais il est plus grave, plus saillant chez les nations protestantes qu'en pays catholiques.

Déjà Newman, en 1877, l'écrivait : « J'ai toujours
« pensé, disait-il, que nous sommes arrivés à une époque
« où l'infidélité se répand partout. En fait, pendant ces
« dernières années, les eaux se sont élevées comme un
« déluge. J'entrevois, pour après ma mort, le moment
« où seuls les sommets des montagnes apparaîtront comme
« des îles dans le désert des eaux. » Et il ajoutait : « Je
« parle surtout du monde protestant. »¹

Oui, « surtout dans le monde protestant », parce que, là, les divergences doctrinales des « confessions » ou « dénominations » qui s'y multiplient privent les consciences religieuses du spectacle lumineux et réconfortant de l'unité dans la Foi. La désagrégation de la communion protestante conduit au libéralisme en matière religieuse, c'est-à-dire, à cette sorte de croyance vague que toutes les religions représentent des opinions libres qui se valent, pour la raison qu'aucune d'elles ne peut invoquer à son profit les preuves d'une Révélation positive et divine ; alors, l'indifférentisme religieux lui-même conduit inévitablement à l'irréligion, au sectarisme antireligieux.

Les Protestants clairvoyants virent se réaliser les prédictions de Newman. Ceux d'entre eux qui ont gardé la Foi à la divinité du Christ et de son Église, ceux qui prient pour eux-mêmes et pour les âmes dont ils ont la charge, discernent le péril, se sentent le devoir des'appliquer à le conjurer. Eux aussi croient à la parole des Actes des Apôtres : « Il n'y a de salut que dans le Christ, » « *Non est in alio aliquo salus.* »²

C'est un groupe de ces hommes de Foi, une élite intellectuelle et morale, que la divine Providence a conduite vers nous et que nous eûmes la consolation d'accueillir.

Nos deux premiers visiteurs furent Lord Halifax, que toute l'Angleterre, sans distinction de religion, ni de parti,

¹ Wilfrid Ward, *The Life of Newman*, ii, p. 416.

² Act. Ap. IV, 12.

vénère et affectionne, et M. l'Abbé Portal, fils de saint Vincent de Paul, prêtre de la Mission, ancien Supérieur de Grand Séminaire, et qui fut intimement mêlé, sous Léon XIII, à la question de la validité des Ordinations anglicanes ; il exerce aujourd'hui auprès de la jeunesse universitaire de Paris un apostolat de premier plan.

Ils nous procurèrent, en octobre 1921, l'occasion de faire personnellement leur connaissance et nous revinrent les 6, 7 et 8 décembre de la même année, accompagnés de deux Anglicans de marque, le Dr. Armitage Robinson, doyen de Wells, ami intime de l'Archevêque de Cantorbéry, et le Dr. Frere, supérieur de la communauté religieuse des Résurrectionnistes, devenu depuis lors évêque de Truro, l'un et l'autre auteurs de publications hautement appréciées sur des sujets scripturaires et d'ancienne littérature chrétienne.

Pour leur donner accueil, nous invitâmes à se joindre à nous M. l'Abbé Portal, et notre savant et dévoué Vicaire Général, Mgr Van Roey, Maître en théologie de l'Université de Louvain.

Il fut, dès l'abord, entendu que l'objet et les résultats éventuels de nos entretiens resteraient privés, jusqu'au jour où, de commun accord, nous jugerions utile et opportun d'en publier les conclusions.

Les deux groupes se retrouvèrent à Malines en mars 1923.

En novembre de la même année, eut lieu une troisième réunion à laquelle prirent part, cette fois, outre le doyen Robinson et le Dr. Frere, le célèbre Dr. Charles Gore, ancien évêque d'Oxford, sorti du ministère actif pour se vouer exclusivement à ses travaux de science religieuse, et le Dr. Kidd, Préfet du Keble College, un des hommes les plus considérés d'Oxford.

Mgr Batiffol, chanoine de Notre-Dame de Paris, si universellement estimé pour ses travaux sur les origines chrétiennes, et M. l'Abbé Hemmer, curé de Saint-Mandé,

qui professa jadis l'histoire à l'Institut Catholique de Paris, avaient bien voulu venir se joindre à nous et nous apporter leur précieux concours.

Tels étaient nos hôtes : voici quel fut le caractère de nos réunions.

Celles-ci, de la première à la dernière, furent *privées* : c'étaient des *conversations* dans un salon privé.

Ce n'était donc pas la rencontre d'autorités ecclésiastiques envoyant l'une vers l'autre leurs délégués officiels.

Cette déclaration que nous émettons ici, l'archevêque de Cantorbéry l'a formulée nettement dans son message à ses Métropolitains ; on semble n'avoir pas voulu le remarquer. Il savait, certes, ses amis en relation à Malines avec des membres du clergé catholique ; il suivait avec un sympathique intérêt le développement de nos entretiens, mais, dès l'abord, il avait tenu à affirmer, comme nous-même d'ailleurs, que nous n'engagions d'aucune façon, ni les communautés auxquelles nous appartenons, ni l'autorité que, dans une certaine mesure, nous représentions.

Nos échanges d'idées ne furent donc pas des « négociations ». Pour négocier, il faut être porteur d'un mandat et, ni de part ni d'autre, nous n'avions de mandat. Aussi bien, en ce qui nous concerne, n'en avions-nous pas sollicité : il nous suffisait de savoir que nous marchions d'accord avec l'Autorité suprême, bénis et encouragés par Elle.

Nous nous mîmes à l'œuvre, animés d'un même désir de mutuelle compréhension et d'aide fraternelle.

Évidemment, sur plusieurs questions fondamentales le désaccord des deux groupes était notoire ; de part et d'autre, on en avait conscience. Mais, nous nous disions que, si la vérité a ses droits, la charité a ses devoirs ; nous pensions que, peut-être, en parlant à cœur ouvert et avec la persuasion intime que, dans un vaste conflit

historique, qui a duré des siècles, tous les torts ne sont pas d'un seul côté ; en précisant les termes de certaines questions en litige, nous ferions tomber des préventions, des méfiances, dissiperions des équivoques, aplanirions les voies au bout desquelles une âme loyale, aidée de la grâce, découvrirait s'il pouvait plaire à Dieu, ou retrouverait la vérité.

Le fait est qu'à l'heure de clôture de chacune de nos trois réunions les membres se sentaient plus étroitement liés, plus confiants les uns dans les autres, qu'à leur prise de contact. Nos hôtes nous l'ont dit ; nous l'ont écrit ; nous leur avons tenu le même langage ; je suis heureux de le répéter ici.

Cependant, l'on pense bien que, lorsque surgirent des questions essentielles—telle la Primauté du Pape définie par le Concile du Vatican, et qui fut la première et la dernière à l'ordre du jour—ni mes amis ni moi n'eûmes, un instant, la pensée de sacrifier à un désir insensé d'union à tout prix un seul article du Credo catholique, apostolique et romain.

Nos rencontres furent donc des conversations privées ; elles n'engageaient que notre responsabilité personnelle ; elles eurent un caractère amical ; j'ajoute qu'elles furent instructives et édifiantes.

Aucun livre ne vaut un commerce oral. La conversation est révélatrice de choses intimes qui ne passent pas dans la lettre imprimée.

Les hommes sont faits pour s'aimer les uns les autres ; il n'est pas rare que des cœurs mutuellement étrangers qui auraient pu, à distance, se croire ennemis, goûtent, à se comprendre, un charme pénétrant qu'ils n'auraient pas soupçonné.

Nos compagnons, à leur départ, avaient l'âme dilatée.

C'est peut-être la première fois, depuis quatre cents ans, disait l'un d'eux, que des hommes d'études, protestants et

catholiques, aient pu s'entretenir, avec une franchise entière, pendant des heures et des heures, sur les sujets les plus graves qui intellectuellement les divisent, sans qu'un instant la cordialité de leurs rapports en ait été troublée, ni leur confiance dans l'avenir déconcertée.

Assurément, le rapprochement des cœurs n'est pas l'unité dans la Foi, mais il y dispose.

Des hommes, surtout des groupements d'hommes qui ont vécu longtemps étrangers les uns aux autres, dans une atmosphère chargée de méfiances sinon d'animosités, ancrées dans les profondeurs des consciences par une tradition quatre fois séculaire, sont mal préparés à se rendre aux argumentations, si serrées soient-elles, que veulent leur imposer leurs contradicteurs.

Avant de définir la justification chrétienne, le Concile de Trente ne dit-il pas que, pour s'y disposer, il faut préparer les cœurs à écouter la parole de Dieu : « *Præparate corda vestra Domino* » ? ¹

Si la Providence divine a conduit vers nous, plutôt que vers d'autres plus directement mêlés à des controverses religieuses, certains chrétiens dissidents, ne serait-ce pas parce que, à raison même de notre isolement, il nous était possible d'accomplir, dans une atmosphère plus sereine, une tâche toute préliminaire à des négociations et à des déterminations qui devraient éventuellement se poursuivre et se conclure ailleurs ?

Au milieu même du bruit qui se faisait autour de la Lettre de l'Archevêque à ses Métropolitains, le membre de nos réunions auquel je faisais allusion à l'instant m'écrivait : « Il serait malaisé à qui n'habite pas l'Angleterre de mesurer l'importance que prendra dans l'opinion publique le résultat qui vient d'être acquis. Même si le succès immédiat est peu considérable, je crois qu'il marquera pour beaucoup un point de départ vers de nouveaux

¹ I Regum, vii. 3.

progrès et que nous aurons les meilleures raisons d'en rendre grâces à Dieu. »¹

Au surplus, à l'issue de chacune de nos conférences nous primes congé les uns des autres en nous promettant de prier, de faire prier nos ouailles pour le succès de la cause sainte qui nous avait réunis.

Il me souvient que le Dr. Kidd, au début de notre dernier entretien, me disait, et j'espère qu'il ne trouvera pas indiscret que je le redise : « J'ai prié avec mes élèves avant de quitter Oxford et je sais qu'ils invoquent en ce moment l'Esprit Saint pour le succès de nos travaux. »

Quant à nous, mes chers Confrères, nous savons que, dans son Encyclique « *Provida Matris* » du 5 mai 1895, le Pape Léon XIII, de sainte mémoire, demanda aux catholiques du monde entier des prières spéciales à l'Esprit Saint, « pour la réconciliation, qu'il espérait avec une « ferme confiance, de nos frères séparés. » Nous savons que, reprenant avec plus d'ampleur encore, dans son Encyclique « *Divinum illud munus* » du 9 mai 1897, la même pensée, il prescrivait une neuvaine de prières, à laquelle vous restez fidèles chaque année, de l'Ascension à la Pentecôte, afin de hâter la réalisation bénie de l'unité chrétienne, « *ad maturandum christianæ unitatis bonum.* »

Le Pape Benoît XV, n'a-t-il pas encouragé une octave de prières, du 18 janvier, fête de la chaire de Saint Pierre, au 25 janvier, fête de la conversion de saint Paul, pour obtenir le retour de nos frères séparés à l'unité de l'Église ?

Et notre Père bien-aimé, le Pape Pie XI, ne nous révèle-t-Il pas les sentiments de charité et de piété de sa grande âme lorsque, dans son Encyclique si paternelle

¹ Avec la permission de l'auteur nous citons l'original : « It is hard for any one outside England to understand how serious the step will appear in the public mind, both among those who care deeply and among those who do not. Even if we get but little further at present, I believe that this will mean a new outlook for very many, and that we shall have good reason for true gratitude to God. . . »

« *Ecclesiam Dei*, » Il invite Latins et Orientaux à se mieux comprendre et prie ceux-ci de ne pas rendre l'Église Romaine responsable des préjugés, des torts personnels de ceux-là ; lorsque aux uns et aux autres Il demande de prier, afin que se réalise l'accord de tous les peuples dans l'unité œcuménique, « *hæc populorum omnium in œcumenica unitate consensio* » ?

Tel est donc l'exposé rapide des faits.

Voici le pourquoi de nos « conversations ».

II

Pourquoi ces conversations ?

Pourquoi ? Tout d'abord, parce que je n'ai pas le droit de me dérober à une occasion qui vient à moi de faire un acte de charité fraternelle et d'hospitalité chrétienne.

Pour rien au monde, je ne voudrais autoriser un de nos frères séparés à dire qu'il a frappé de confiance à la porte d'un évêque catholique romain et que cet évêque catholique romain a refusé de lui ouvrir.

Une grande nation fut, pendant plus de huit siècles, notre sœur aimée ; elle donna à l'Église une phalange de saints que nous honorons encore aujourd'hui dans notre liturgie ; elle a gardé au sein d'un vaste empire des ressources étonnantes de vitalité chrétienne, elle exerce un rayonnement immense sur d'innombrables missions, mais elle porte au flanc une blessure ; nous, catholiques, maintenus par la grâce de Dieu dans la vérité intégrale, nous nous lamentons sur le déchirement criminel qui l'arracha, il y a quatre siècles, à l'Église notre Mère ; et, ce sont des catholiques qui voudraient qu'à l'exemple du Lévite et du Prêtre de la Loi ancienne réprouvés par notre divin Sauveur dans la parabole du Samaritain un évêque catholique passât à côté de ce grand blessé, dans une indifférence superbe, refusât de verser une goutte d'huile

dans sa plaie béante, de la bander, et de s'essayer à amener l'infirme à l'hôtel-Dieu où l'appelle la divine Miséricorde !

Je me serais jugé coupable si j'avais commis cette lâcheté.

Oh ! je le sais, ceux qui nous jugent de travers ne voudront pas méconnaître nos intentions charitables, mais ils estiment notre intervention inopportune et inefficace.

Inopportune, parce qu'il vaut mieux, selon eux, laisser les églises séparées aller à une décomposition complète, s'accuser plus fort le contraste entre l'erreur et la vérité : arrivé aux extrêmes, le mal épouvantera, et ce sera l'heure du triomphe de la vérité.

Inefficace, parce que, semble-t-il, je n'emploie pas la bonne méthode d'apostolat, celle des conversions individuelles.

Pesons, un instant, ces deux griefs.

Je ne trouve nulle part préconisée ni approuvée dans l'Évangile la politique du pire. J'y lis, au contraire, qu'il ne faut pas étouffer la mèche qui fume encore.

Que des protestants croyants tombent dans le libéralisme en matière religieuse, que ses victimes deviennent indifférentes à toute religion positive, aboutissent à l'irreligion, aillent grossir les rangs de l'athéisme, et, bientôt après, ceux de l'anarchie : c'est un mal, un grand mal.

Des chrétiens sincères se sentent impuissants—ne le sommes-nous pas nous-mêmes dans une moindre mesure ? —à enrayer ce mal, font appel à notre aide secourable, nous invitent tout au moins à nous concerter avec eux pour enrayer l'irreligion, et il se trouverait des esprits outranciers pour nous l'interdire !

Voilà donc, déjà, un premier service positif à rendre à nos frères séparés, une première raison de les accueillir à cœur ouvert.

Soit, dira-t-on peut-être, mais là n'était pas votre objectif principal : il s'agissait, avant tout, d'exercer une

action directe sur des croyants, membres de « la Haute-Église », afin de les ramener à l'Église de Rome.

L'objectif principal ! Qu'en savez-vous ? Nous n'avons jamais sérié, par ordre d'importance, les motifs inspirateurs de notre conduite.

Nous avons considéré une situation d'ensemble où nous apparaissaient des âmes, soucieuses à la fois d'elles-mêmes et de leur influence sociale. Nous avons eu la confiance de penser que nous pouvions rendre un service d'aide spirituelle à nos frères et trouvé là une seconde raison de converser avec eux.

Mais vous jugez que nous nous y prenons mal pour dénouer cette situation : notre méthode de travail est, selon vous, maladroite ; l'expérience vous a appris qu'il faut renoncer à agir sur les collectivités ; il faut ne viser que les individus.

De quel droit limitez-vous l'action de la divine Miséricorde ? Agissez, tant que vous le pouvez, sur les individus ; éclairez, de votre mieux, chacune des âmes que Dieu met sur votre chemin, priez pour elle, dévouez-vous à elle : parfait ; nul ne pourrait songer à vous en blâmer.

Mais, qu'est-ce qui vous autorise à écarter les collectivités ? C'est votre exclusivisme qui est condamnable.

Laissez-moi rafraîchir vos souvenirs. Écoutez la grande voix de Léon XIII, qui, le 14 avril 1895, dans sa Lettre Apostolique « *Amantissimæ Voluntatis* », s'adressait, non aux individus, mais à la masse du peuple anglais, « *ad Anglos* ». Relisez cette Encyclique, elle a pour destinataire la nation appelée par le Pape « *gens Anglorum illustris* » ; et quand, au moment de conclure, le saint Pontife pressent les objections que des pessimistes opposeront à son optimisme, il écrit : « Des difficultés, il y en a, oui, mais elles « ne sont pas de nature à ralentir le moins du monde notre « charité apostolique, ni à décourager vos volontés. » « *Difficultates, si quæ sunt, non sunt tamen ejusmodi ut*

« aut caritatem nostram Apostolicam omnino iis retardari,
 « aut voluntatem vestram deterreri oporteat ». « Sans
 « doute, les révolutions et une séparation plusieurs fois
 « séculaire ont enraciné des dissentiments dans les cœurs :
 « mais, est-ce une raison de renoncer à tout espoir de
 « réconciliation et de paix ? » « Esto, quod rerum con-
 « versionibus ac diuturnitate ipsa dissidium convaluerit :
 « num idcirco reconciliationis pacisque remedia respuat
 « omnia ? » « Nullement, s'il plaît à Dieu. » « Nequaquam
 « ita, si Deo placet. »

« Pour évaluer les résultats que peut promettre l'avenir,
 « il ne faut pas se baser seulement sur des calculs humains,
 « il faut surtout tenir compte de la puissance et de la
 « miséricorde de Dieu. » « Sunt eventus rerum non pro-
 « visione humana tantummodo sed maxime virtute
 « pietateque divina metiendi. »

« Lorsque nous sommes aux prises avec une œuvre vaste
 « et laborieuse, » — c'est toujours le Pape qui parle—
 « ayons une intention droite et le cœur généreux ; et
 « Dieu alors sera avec nous ; c'est à triompher des
 « obstacles que se révèle avec le plus d'éclat la beauté de
 « l'action de la divine Providence. » « In rebus enim
 « magnis atque arduis, si modo sint sincero et bono animo
 « susceptæ, adest homini Deus, cujus Providentia ab ipsis
 « inceptorum difficultatibus capit quo magnificentius
 « eluceat. »

Une année et demie plus tard, en septembre 1896, le Pape se voit obligé d'infliger aux Anglicans une déception amère : il proclame l'invalidité de leurs ordinations. Va-t-il abandonner ses larges espoirs et ne préconiser plus que la propagande d'individu à individu ? Au contraire, il conclut sa Lettre Apostolique « *Apostolicæ curæ* » par un appel direct aux ministres qu'il a eu la douleur de peiner et il conjure les individus et la masse de s'inspirer ensuite de l'exemple de leur conversion.

« Nous ne cesserons pas, dit-il, de travailler, autant que
« nous le pourrons, à leur réconciliation avec l'Église ; les
« individus et les groupes trouveront alors en eux, c'est
« notre ardent désir, de puissants exemples à imiter. »
« Nos quidem, quantum omni ope licuerit, eorum (re-
« ligionis ministrorum) cum Ecclesia reconciliationem
« fovere non desistemus ; ex qua *singuli* et *ordines*, id
« quod vehementer cupimus, multum capere possunt ad
« imitandum. »

C'est que, mes chers Confrères, aujourd'hui encore, en dépit de toutes les déclamations emphatiques sur les progrès intellectuels des masses populaires, sur l'indépendance de leur pensée et la souveraineté de leurs initiatives, le peuple ne précède pas, il suit, il ne commande pas, il obéit. Même en démocratie, le régime social reste oligarchique. Des tribuns démagogues, d'une part, des élites, d'autre part, se disputent l'hégémonie des foules, les premiers pour prêcher la violence et soulever les révolutions, les secondes, pour sauvegarder l'ordre et la discipline.

Si donc il est dans le plan de la divine Providence que nos frères séparés de nous depuis Luther, Henri VIII et la reine Élisabeth, rentrent un jour dans le giron de l'Église, il appartient aux élites d'ouvrir les voies à ce mouvement de retour. Que des autorités morales respectées de tous entrent dans une conception plus sereine des relations voulues par le Christ entre les fidèles, l'épiscopat et la Papauté, un grand pas sera fait dans le sens de l'unité catholique. C'est ce que Léon XIII déclarait si nettement dans sa Lettre « *ad Anglos* » ; c'est ce dont, à la suite de cet illustre Pontife, nous avons essayé de nous pénétrer dans nos « conversations de Malines ».

Si, après cela, vous nous demandez quelles étaient, quelles sont encore aujourd'hui nos espérances, nous ne pouvons que vous répondre, avec Notre Saint-Père le Pape Pie XI, que « l'unité des peuples dans la Foi catho-

lique est, avant tout, l'œuvre de Dieu, » « *Hæc populorum « omnium in œcumenica unitate consensio opus in primis est « Dei . . . »*¹ La Providence universelle la réalise dans le temps avec force et douceur. « *Attingit . . . ad finem fortiter et disponit omnia suaviter,* »² mais l'heure des résultats est son secret. Il y emploie les causes secondes ; aux apôtres de son divin Fils Il daigne demander leur collaboration : de personne Il ne réclame, à personne Il ne promet le succès.

III

Un enseignement.

La condition essentielle de la fécondité de l'apostolat.

Cette condition, le Vicaire du Christ nous l'a rappelée dans cet avertissement : « Les grands événements religieux de l'histoire ne se peuvent évaluer par des calculs humains. »

Dans une œuvre dont le résultat est le salut des âmes, le facteur essentiel n'est ni la sagesse humaine, ni la sagacité des tacticiens, c'est la bonne simplicité évangélique, la foi à la divine miséricorde, à la toute-puissance de la grâce qui suppléera, au besoin, à l'insuffisance des procédés.

Cette foi ardente est à l'origine, au milieu, au terme de tout effort d'apostolat.

Seule, elle est capable de soutenir la constance du missionnaire ; seule elle lui assurera, quoi qu'il advienne, sa récompense.

Dans le domaine surnaturel, « ce n'est », dit saint Paul, « ni de vouloir, ni de courir qui importe, c'est de se fier « à la miséricorde de Dieu. » « *Neque volentis, neque « currentis, sed miserentis est Dei.* »³

« Vous aurez beau planter, » dit-il encore, « arroser vos « plantations, un seul a le pouvoir de donner aux organismes vivants la croissance, c'est Dieu. » « *Neque qui*

¹ Encycl. *Ecclesiam Dei*.

² Sap. viii. 1.

³ Rom. ix. 16.

« plantat est aliquid, neque qui rigat, sed qui incrementum
« dat, Deus. » ¹

Vous vous impatientez, le succès est lent à venir, vos peines vous semblent perdues. Soyez sur vos gardes ; la nature et ses empressements vous égarent : un effort de charité n'est jamais perdu. Mais « les fruits de salut réclament une longue patience » : « fructum afferatis in patientia. » ²

Ne voyez-vous pas comment la Providence conduit les causes secondes ? Dans l'ordre de la nature, le laboureur jette les graines dans ses sillons laborieusement creusés, puis il laisse passer les frimas de l'hiver, il attend le soleil du printemps, les chaleurs de l'été, et ce n'est qu'après cette longue attente, faite d'alternances de craintes et d'espoirs, qu'il a enfin la joie de récolter et d'engranger ses moissons.

Nous aussi, moissonneurs d'âmes, le Christ nous en a prévenus, nous avons à semer à la sueur de notre front, et, le plus souvent, dans les larmes, avant que sonne l'heure de la moisson ; et quand sonnera cette heure bénie un autre vraisemblablement aura pris notre place. « Alius est « qui seminat, et alius est qui metit. » ³ « Qui seminant in « lacrymis, in exultatione metent. Euntes ibant et flebant « mittentes semina sua. Venientes autem venient cum « exultatione, portantes manipulos suos. » ⁴

Conclusion.

Mes bien chers Confrères, je conclus. Si j'ai pris aujourd'hui la parole pour vous mettre au courant d'un effort qui, dans ma pensée, devait rester secret, c'est parce que je me suis aperçu que plusieurs de nos confrères d'Outre-Manche, égarés par des informations fantaisistes et des commentaires hasardés de la presse, interprétaient

¹ 1 Cor. iii. 7.

² Luc. viii. 15. Cfr. 2 Cor. vi. 4.

³ Joan. iv. 38.

⁴ Ps. cxxv. 5-6.

erronément mon action et s'en offensaient ; c'est aussi parce que, dénaturée à vos yeux, cette action eût pu, non seulement me priver d'un pieux concours que j'attends de vous en ceci comme en tout ce qu'il m'est donné d'entreprendre à la gloire de notre Dieu, mais fausser même la conception spirituellement désintéressée que vous devez vous faire de l'apostolat.

J'espère avoir réussi à dissiper le léger nuage de poussière qui, un instant, s'est interposé entre nos amis d'Angleterre et nous-mêmes.

J'espère aussi avoir avivé vos sympathies pour la cause sainte de l'unité de l'Église, en réponse au vœu suprême du Pasteur des pasteurs, *le* Pasteur par excellence, Notre Seigneur Jésus : « Ut omnes unum sint » « Que tous ne fassent qu'un ! »

« Je suis *le* bon Pasteur¹ », dit-Il ; « je connais (d'une connaissance toute chargée d'amour) les brebis qui sont « miennes, et celles qui sont miennes me connaissent, de « même que mon Père me connaît (et m'aime) et que je « connais (et que j'aime) mon Père. Aussi donné-je ma « vie pour le troupeau (confié à mes soins). Ego sum « Pastor bonus : et cognosco oves meas et cognoscunt me « meæ, sicut novit me Pater et ego agnosco Patrem. »

Mais aussitôt, Il ajoute : « Puis, j'ai d'autres brebis « encore. » — Il ne dit pas : « Je les aurai, » ni « Je les « voudrais avoir, » Il dit : « Je les ai, elles sont à moi, « *habeo* » ; — oui, « J'ai d'autres brebis encore qui, présente- « ment, ne font pas partie de mon bercail ; il faut me les « amener, et alors, quand vous me les aurez amenées, proche « de moi, et qu'elles entendront ma voix, il n'y aura plus « qu'un seul bercail et un unique Pasteur. » « Et alias « oves habeo, quæ non sunt ex hoc ovili : et illas oportet « me adducere, et vocem meam audient, et fiet unum ovile « et unus pastor. »²

¹ Ποιμήν ὁ καλός.

² Joan. x. 14-16.

Vous l'avez entendue, mes chers Confrères, la parole du Maître : « Oportet », « il faut me les amener. »

Allez donc dans les broussailles, le long des sentiers rocaillieux, sous le soleil brûlant du désert, allez partout où il y a des brebis à découvrir et à sauver.

Ne vous préoccupez pas du succès ; Dieu ne l'exige pas de vous ; ce qu'Il réclame de vous, dit saint Bernard, c'est le soin des malades, Il se réserve de les guérir : « Curam exigeris, non curationem. »¹

A travers tout l'exercice de votre ministère pastoral, priez, peinez, donnez, dépensez-vous ; commencez, tenez bon, persévérez ; fidèles toujours au mot de saint Bernard, ne perdez jamais confiance ; à vous le travail, à Dieu le succès, « Noli diffidere, curam exigeris, non curationem. »

Votre tout dévoué in X^o,

† D. J. CARD. MERCIER, *Archev. de Malines.*

¹ *De Consideratione*, Lib. iv, Cap. ii.

APPENDIX

I

*The World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches*¹

CONSTITUTION

OBJECT

The object of the Alliance is to carry into effect the following resolutions passed at the Conference at Constance on the 2nd of August 1914, viz. :

1. That, inasmuch as the work of conciliation and the promotion of amity is essentially a Christian task, it is expedient that the Churches in all lands should use their influence with the peoples, parliaments and governments of the world to bring about good and friendly relations between the nations, so that, along the path of peaceful civilization, they may reach that universal goodwill which Christianity has taught mankind to aspire after.

2. That, inasmuch as all sections of the Church of Christ are equally concerned in the maintenance of peace and the promotion of good feeling among all the races of the world, it is advisable for them to act in concert in their efforts to carry the foregoing resolution into effect.

3. That in order to enable the different Churches to be brought into touch with one another, steps should be taken to form in every country councils of either a denominational or interdenominational character (as the circumstances of each case require), whose object it will be to enlist the

¹ President 1924, The Archbishop of Canterbury. *Chairman of the International Committee*, Rev. Nehemiah Boynton, D.D., New York. *Joint Honorary Secretaries*, Rt. Hon. Sir Willoughby H. Dickinson, K.B.E., 41 Parliament St., London, S.W. : Rev. Frederick Lynch, D.D., New York ; M. Jacque Dumas, Paris ; Pastor Dr. F. Siegmund-Schultze, Berlin ; Rev. Dr. Knut B. Westman, Upsala ; Professor Eugène Choisy, Geneva.

Churches, in their corporate capacity, in a joint endeavour to achieve the promotion of international friendship and the avoidance of war, and that for this purpose a central bureau should be established for facilitating correspondence between such councils, collecting and distributing information and generally co-ordinating the work connected with the movement.

CONSTITUTION

I. The Alliance shall consist of Constituent Councils formed in accordance with the third resolution, and having as their object the object of the Alliance as set out above.

CONSTITUENT COUNCILS

II. Every Constituent Council shall appoint its own officers, make its own rules, and administer its own affairs in such manner as it thinks best suited for the requirements and conditions of its own work.

ANNUAL REPORTS

III. Every Constituent Council shall, on or before the 1st of March, send to the Central Committee a report on the work done during the last calendar year, and the International Committee shall collect and print all these reports and circulate them together with a report of their own work to all the Constituent Councils.

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE

IV. There shall be an International Committee consisting of members nominated by the Constituent Councils. A member shall hold office for three years from the date of his nomination, but may be renominated. The number of members to be nominated by each Constituent Council shall be determined from time to time by the International Committee.

NEW CONSTITUENT COUNCILS

V. The International Committee may recognize a new Constituent Council, and shall decide the number of members which such Council may nominate to the International Committee.

DUTIES OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE

VI. The International Committee shall deal with all matters of common interest to the Alliance, and regulate the general conduct of its affairs, and shall keep the Constituent Councils in touch with one another and acquainted with the progress of the movement. It shall summon a general conference of the Alliance whenever it deems this to be advisable. It shall elect its own officers, and may appoint sub-committees and delegate to such sub-committees such of its own powers as it may think fit.

THE BUREAU

VII. The International Committee shall establish and maintain a Bureau, with such officers as may be necessary for conducting the affairs of the Alliance.

ALTERATION OF RULES

VIII. These rules may be altered either at a general conference of Constituent Councils summoned for the purpose, or by the International Committee recommending the alteration to all the Constituent Councils and obtaining the written consent of three-fourths of those councils to the proposed alteration.

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE

The following gives the Constitution of the International Committee as settled in August 1920. Each constituent council appoints its own delegates, and may nominate members to fill vacancies when they occur. In the event of a member being unable to attend a meeting of the International Committee, the council of which he is a member may appoint a substitute :

The American Council	.	.	.	.	13 members.
The British Council	.	.	.	.	8 "
The French Council	.	.	.	.	8 "
The German Council	.	.	.	.	8 "
The Danish Council	.	.	.	.	4 "
The Dutch Council	.	.	.	.	4 "
The Italian Council	.	.	.	.	4 "

The Norwegian Council	.	.	.	.	4	members
The Swedish Council	.	.	.	.	4	"
The Swiss Council	.	.	.	.	4	"
The Belgian Council	.	.	.	.	4	"
The Hungarian Council	.	.	.	.	4	"
The Esthonian Council	.	.	.	.	4	"
The Lettland Council	.	.	.	.	4	"
The Finland Council	.	.	.	.	4	"
The Greek Council	.	.	.	.	4	"
The Austrian Council	.	.	.	.	4	"
The Czecho-Slovakian Council	.	.	.	.	4	"
The Serb-Croat-Slovene Council	.	.	.	.	4	"
The Japanese Council	.	.	.	.	4	"
The Bulgarian Council	.	.	.	.	4	"
The Roumanian Council	.	.	.	.	4	"
The Turkish Council	.	.	.	.	4	"
The Spanish Council	.	.	.	.	4	"
The Portuguese Council	.	.	.	.	4	"
The Polish Council	.	.	.	.	4	"

MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE

The Management Sub-Committee consists of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the International Committee, together with the six Honorary Secretaries of the Alliance and other members appointed by the International Committee.

Reference to the Management Sub-Committee

1. There is delegated to the Management Sub-Committee the management of the business of the International Committee during the intervals between the sessions of that Committee, provided that all action taken by the Management Sub-Committee be reported to the Committee at its next meeting.

2. The Management Sub-Committee shall meet as often as convenient, but in the event of its being difficult to hold a meeting the decision of the Committee on any question may be obtained by correspondence.

3. If any member of the Management Sub-Committee is unable to attend any meeting he may appoint a substitute to act in his place.

II

*The International Missionary Council*¹

(a) CONSTITUTION

[Adopted at Lake Mohonk, New York, U.S.A., October 1921]

I. PREAMBLE

The Council is established on the basis that the only bodies entitled to determine missionary policy are the missionary societies and boards, or the churches which they represent, and the churches in the mission field.

It is recognized that the successful working of the International Missionary Council is entirely dependent on the gift from God of the spirit of fellowship, mutual understanding and desire to co-operate.

II. MEMBERSHIP

The Council is constituted by the national missionary organizations² in the different countries. Except as may be determined otherwise by subsequent action of the Council, representation shall be as follows :

United Missionary Council of Australia . . .	2
Société Belge de Missions Protestantes au Congo .	1
National Christian Council of China . . .	3
Dansk Missionsraad	2
Deutscher Evangelischer Missionsbund . . .	6
Société des Missions Evangéliques de Paris . .	4
Conference of Missionary Societies in Great Britain and Ireland	14

¹ *Chairman* 1924, John R. Mott. *Secretaries*, J. H. Oldham ; A. L. Warnshuis. *Office*, Edinburgh House, 2 Eaton Gate, London, S.W.

² The term ' national missionary organization ' is used to describe the interdenominational conferences or committees in which in different sending countries the missionary societies are united for common consultation and co-operation. It should be noted, however, that the Foreign Missions Conference of North America is international, including the mission boards both of the United States and Canada.

National Christian Council of India, Burma and Ceylon	3
Japan Continuation Committee	3
Commissie van Advies (The Netherlands)	2
Missionary Societies of New Zealand	1
Norsk Missionsraad	2
Foreign Missions Conference of North America (United States and Canada)	20
Missionary Societies of South Africa	2
Suomen Lähetysneuvosto (National Joint Missions Committee of Finland)	1
Svenska Missionsradet	2
Association of Missionary Societies in Switzerland	2

In countries where there is no representative organization the Committee of the Council, provided for later, shall determine the method of representation.

Two out of the three representatives each from Japan, China and India shall be nationals of these countries.

The Committee of the Council, provided for later, shall have power to nominate for each meeting co-opted members not exceeding ten in all from countries and mission fields not otherwise represented, including Africa, the Near East, and Latin America, who shall for each meeting have the same rights and privileges as other members.

National missionary organizations may appoint substitutes to attend any meeting of the Council in place of regular members, and each such substitute shall have during the meeting all the privileges of a member of the Council.

Co-operation shall be sought with other national missionary organizations which may come into existence, or with missionary agencies of Christian communions not at present participating in the International Missionary Council, whenever conditions make such co-operation possible.

Members of the Council shall hold office until their successors are appointed, the length of term of office and the method of appointment to be determined in each country by the national missionary organization.

III. FUNCTIONS

The functions of the Council shall be the following :

1. To stimulate thinking and investigation on missionary questions, to enlist in the solution of these questions the best knowledge and experience to be found in all countries, and to make the results available for all missionary societies and missions.
2. To help to co-ordinate the activities of the national missionary organizations of the different countries and of the societies they represent, and to bring about united action where necessary in missionary matters.
3. Through common consultation to help to unite Christian public opinion in support of freedom of conscience and religion and of missionary liberty.
4. To help to unite the Christian forces of the world in seeking justice in international and inter-racial relations.
5. To be responsible for the publication of the *International Review of Missions* and such other publications as in the judgement of the Council may contribute to the study of missionary questions.
6. To call a world missionary conference if and when this should be deemed desirable.

IV. OFFICERS

The Council shall have power to appoint officers to carry out functions assigned to it. These officers shall be elected at each regular meeting of the Council to serve until and through the next regular meeting. They shall be members, ex officio, of the Council. The countries from which they come shall be allowed their full representation in addition to such officials. The officers of the Council shall act in consultation with the Committee of the Council, hereafter referred to, in all emergencies arising during the intervals between meetings of the Council.

V. THE COMMITTEE OF THE COUNCIL

The Council shall appoint at each regular meeting a Committee of sixteen members, to be called 'the Committee of the Council', to act for it in the intervals between its meetings, with the right to fill vacancies in its own membership. The officers of the Council shall be members, *ex officio*, of the Committee, and shall serve as the officers of the Committee of the Council.

The Committee of the Council shall, as occasion may require, consult with the several national missionary organizations during the intervals between the meetings of the Council, in regard to the work entrusted to the Committee.

The Committee of the Council shall meet at the call of the officers of the Council, or upon request of a majority of the members of the Committee (sent to the chairman or secretaries in writing), or upon the request of three or more national missionary organizations. Five members of the Committee other than the officers shall constitute a quorum, provided, however, that these represent three different countries or national organizations and that at least one of them is a representative of a country outside the continent in which the meeting is held.

No action shall be taken or pronouncement made by the Committee of the Council except in matters of urgency and when the Committee is confident that the action or pronouncement will commend itself to the several national missionary organizations.

VI. EXPENSES

The Council or the Committee of the Council shall prepare annual budgets two years in advance, which shall be submitted to the national missionary organizations of the sending countries for approval and toward which they will be invited to contribute in a proportion to be recommended by resolution of the Council.

VII. MEETINGS AND PROCEDURE

The Council shall ordinarily meet every second year, but a special meeting of the Council may be called or the regular meeting postponed if the Committee of the Council, after consulting with the national missionary organizations, is satisfied that this is desirable.

It is understood that the Council will function internationally, and that the members of the Council in any one country will not take action as a national group though they may be called together by the officers of the International Missionary Council for purposes of consultation if this should seem necessary.

The minutes of the Council and of the Committee of the Council shall be transmitted to the national missionary organizations, thus affording them opportunity to express their opinion with reference to the same.

VIII. AMENDMENTS

This Constitution may be amended at any future meeting of the Council subject to the approval of the constituent national organizations.

(b) MISSIONARY CO-OPERATION IN VIEW OF
DOCTRINAL DIFFERENCES

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL, OXFORD,
JULY 9-16, 1923

1. The International Missionary Council orders the papers of Dr. Robert E. Speer and the Bishop of Bombay, which were read before it, to be printed.¹ While the authors alone are responsible for the views expressed in those papers, the Council believes that a study of the papers will throw light on the questions about the possibility of missionary co-operation which are raised by doctrinal differences.

2. The International Missionary Council has given attention to the anxiety which is felt in many quarters

¹ Published in the *International Review of Missions*, October 1923.

about the possibility of missionary co-operation in face of doctrinal differences and thinks it opportune to review the co-operation which has actually been undertaken under its auspices or those of the national and other councils which it correlates and other similar co-operative action, and to set out afresh the principles which have emerged from these experiences.

3. The International Council has never sought, nor is it its function, to work out a body of doctrinal opinions of its own. The only doctrinal opinions in the Council are those which the various members bring with them into it from the Churches and Missionary Boards to which they belong. It is no part of the duty of the Council to discuss the merits of those opinions, still less to determine doctrinal questions.

But it has never been found in practice that in consequence of this the Council is left with nothing but an uncertain mass of conflicting opinions. The Council is conscious of a great measure of agreement which centres in a common obligation and a common loyalty. We are conscious of a common obligation to proclaim the Gospel of Christ in all the world, and this sense of obligation is made rich and deep because of our knowledge of the havoc wrought by sin and of the efficacy of the salvation offered by Christ. We are bound together further by a common loyalty to Jesus Himself, and this loyalty is deep and fruitful because we rejoice to share the confessions of St. Peter, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God,' and of St. Thomas, 'My Lord and my God.' The secret of our co-operation is the presence with us of Jesus Christ, Human Friend and Divine Helper. From this common obligation and this common loyalty flow many other points of agreement, and our differences in doctrine, great though in some instances they are, have not hindered us from profitable co-operation in counsel. When we have gathered together, we have experienced a growing unity among ourselves, in which we recognize the influence of the Holy Spirit. At these meetings we have come to a common mind on many matters and been able to frame recommendations and statements. These have never had the character of command or direction, and it has always rested with the Churches or Missions to give them, if they would, authority by adopting them or carrying them into action.

Co-operation in work is more likely to be embarrassed by doctrinal differences than co-operation in counsel. Yet there is a wide range of matters such as negotiations with governments, the securing of religious liberty, the combating of the evils arising from the sale of narcotic drugs, collection and survey of facts, investigation of educational method, &c., which are not affected by doctrinal differences. A still more imposing list might be drawn up of types of work in which impediments from doctrinal differences might have been anticipated, but experience in many lands has shown that most valuable co-operation is possible between many churches and missions. Such are the translation of the Holy Scriptures, the production and dissemination of Christian Literature, the conduct of schools and colleges and medical institutions, and provision for the training of missionaries. Every piece of co-operation in work which this Council or, as we believe, any council connected with it encourages or guides is confined to those churches or missions which freely and willingly take part in it. It would be entirely out of harmony with the spirit of this movement to press for such co-operation in work as would be felt to compromise doctrinal principles or to strain consciences.

III

The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work

TO BE HELD AT STOCKHOLM 1925

[The suggestion that an International Christian Conference dealing with questions of Life and Work should be held in the near future has been put forward in different countries both during and since the War, notably in Scandinavia, America, and Great Britain. It found favour at the Meeting of the International Committee of the World Alliance for promoting International Friendship through the Churches at The Hague 1919, and was further discussed at Geneva in August 1920. An important Meeting defining its object and character took place at Hälsingborg, Sweden, August 1922, under the Chairmanship of the Archbishop of Upsala, representatives being present from Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Holland, Hungary, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Great Britain, United States of America, and the Eastern Churches. It was agreed that the Archbishop of Upsala should be President of the International Committee of the Universal Conference, that the Reverend Henry

A. Atkinson, D.D., should be General Executive Secretary, and that the Assistant Secretaries should be Professor E. Choisy, D.D., Geneva; the Reverend Adolph Keller, D.D., Zurich; and the Reverend Thomas Nightingale (General Secretary of the National Free Church Council, London).]

(a) PROGRAMME OF THE CONFERENCE

Adopted at Hälsingborg, Sweden, August 12-15, 1922

1. The Church's Obligation in view of God's Purpose for the World.
2. The Church and Economical and Industrial Problems.
3. The Church and Social and Moral Problems.
4. The Church and International Relations.
5. The Church and Christian Education.
6. Methods of Co-operative and Federative efforts by the Christian Communions.

(b) STATEMENT AS TO MEMBERSHIP

Adopted at Hälsingborg August 12-15, 1922

We repeat and emphasize the declaration, made at the Geneva Conference in 1920, that inasmuch as our aim is to hold a Universal Conference of the Church of Christ, all organized branches or Communions of the Universal Church of Christ are invited to participate in it, and all parts of the Christian Church throughout the world which signify their willingness to participate shall be admitted to co-operation on terms of equality with all others.

(c) A LETTER DEFINING THE RELATION OF THE CONFERENCE TO THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER

Adopted at Hälsingborg, August 12-15, 1922

DEAR MR. GARDINER,

Your letters to his Grace the Archbishop of Upsala, as well as your letters to Dr. Macfarland and others in which you suggest that the Universal Conference of the Church of Christ on Life and Work should be held at the same place and about the same time as the Conference on Faith and

Order, so that some delegates may attend both Conferences, were laid before the Life and Work Committee held at Hälsingborg on August 12, 1922.

All the members of the Committee on Life and Work, fully recognizing the importance of the work of the Faith and Order movement, are in sympathy with its aims and are grateful to you for the excellent and self-sacrificing work you have done in connexion with that movement. Before the Church can be one and the prayer of our blessed Lord that His disciples may be one can be fully answered, there must be agreement on Faith and Order.

We are with you in your ideal, and realize how much you have done to bring this ideal before the various communions and the large measure of success you have attained.

Nevertheless, the Committee on Life and Work, having carefully considered your proposal, has come to the conclusion that it will be wiser not to hold two World Conferences at the same time and place. The advantage of the convenience to those who are identified with both movements would, they venture to think, be more than counter-balanced by the confusion which would be created in the mind of the public.

The realization of the ideal of the Faith and Order movement must be comparatively remote, whereas the Christian communions can without difficulty unite here and now in the application of Christian ethics and the spirit of Christ to the problems of the present day.

The Bishop of Winchester has rightly said : ' That in the region of moral and social questions we desire all Christians to begin at once to act together as if they were one body in one visible fellowship. This can be done by all alike without any injury to theological principles.' As Dr. Kapler has said : ' Doctrine divides, but service unites.'

We are concerned with service, and we believe that by serving the co-operation of the churches we shall break down prejudices and create a spirit of fellowship which will render the accomplishment of the aims of the Faith and Order movement less difficult to achieve.

Meanwhile, we are of the opinion that the two movements had better be kept distinct. Life and Work confining itself in the main to the co-operation of the Churches in the application of the Spirit and Teaching of Christ to social,

national and international relationships, while Faith and Order devotes its attention to the ultimate but more remote goal of unity in Doctrine and Church Order.

We may say that after careful and sympathetic consideration of your proposal, the Committee on Life and Work are unanimous as to the wisdom of keeping the two Conferences entirely distinct.

In behalf of the Executive Committee of the Universal Conference of the Church of Christ on Life and Work in its session at Hälsingborg, August 14, 1922,

Sincerely and fraternally yours,

NATHAN SÖDERBLOM

Chairman at the Session
in Hälsingborg

HENRY A. ATKINSON

General Executive Secretary

(d) AIM OF THE CONFERENCE

As defined by the International Executive Committee,
meeting at Zurich, Switzerland, April 16-18, 1923

The Conference on Life and Work, without entering into questions of Faith and Order, aims to unite the different churches in common practical work, to furnish the Christian conscience with an organ of expression in the midst of the great spiritual movements of our time, and to insist that the principles of the Gospel be applied to the solution of contemporary social and international problems.

IV

The Murren Conference

THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS

[A Conference to consider Resolution 13 of the Lambeth Conference 1920.]

September 1923

The Conference held at Murren during the first ten days of this month was convened to consider the appeal of the

Lambeth Conference contained in Clause XIII of the Report, which runs as follows :

‘ The Conference recommends that wherever it has not already been done, councils representing all Christian communions should be formed within such areas as may be deemed most convenient as centres of united efforts, to promote the physical, moral and social welfare of the people, and the extension of the rule of Christ among all nations, and over every region of human life.’

The Conference realizes and desires to emphasize the great importance of this clause of the Lambeth Appeal to all Christian people, and believes that on the lines therein laid down much may be done to advance unity in Christian effort. By such concentrated and combined work in social and moral reform a new impetus will be given to many movements of great importance to the world, and the forces which are working for the reconstruction of society on the ethical foundations of Christianity will be greatly strengthened and the Kingdom of God will be advanced. The Members of the Conference felt that in the time at their disposal it was not possible to deal fully or adequately with all the great issues involved in this clause.

At the same time they desire to place on record the judgement of the Conference on these issues so far as they are able to formulate them.

The Conference has carefully considered the duties of the CHURCH IN RELATION TO INTERNATIONAL PEACE.

The Conference declares its abhorrence of the doctrine that war is inevitable, and holds that unless civilization is to be destroyed war must be replaced by rational and moral forces. It holds that it is the duty of the Church to declare that the goal of mankind should be universal peace. Moreover, the Church is bound to insist that war even in defence of the suffering and the oppressed is a most deplorable instrument for achieving its aims and that wars of aggression are both a blunder and a crime.

The Conference believes that wars can be most effectively prevented by the creation of a new moral atmosphere, and that in this question, as in all others, the only hope of improvement is in obedience to the Christian standard by the individual, the Church, and the Nation.

The Conference strongly affirms its confidence in the League of Nations and appeals to all Christian people to support the League of Nations Union and strengthen public opinion in support of this great movement.

The Conference shares in the deep and growing concern amongst Christians at the failure to secure a more thorough application of the teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ to the ORGANIZATION OF MODERN INDUSTRY. Whilst not entirely agreed as to the particular method of dealing with so difficult a problem it is one in its determined resolution to support every effort that may lead to a more Christian order of industry, in which the workers shall enjoy a larger share in its control, a just reward of their labour, and a greater security of employment. The Conference expresses its deep concern at the present amount of unemployment and its desire to support all considered proposals for its removal.

On the question of BETTING AND GAMBLING the Conference appeals to all Christian people to use their influence to oppose any proposal to give State recognition to betting by licensing and taxing bookmakers, or in any other way. In order that the Church may go into this contest with clean hands, the Conference holds it to be imperative that the raising of money for Church or charitable purposes by raffles, sweepstakes, or any other doubtful means should be completely discontinued.

The Conference expresses its strong support of the work of the Temperance Council of the Christian Churches, and welcomes it as a signal illustration of the way in which the combined forces of the Christian Church can accomplish great social ends.

Without judging the issue of prohibition in the United States of America, the Conference feels that the deliberate adoption of this measure by a great people is entitled to the respect of all other nations, and it therefore strongly condemns those who, in the Press or otherwise, seek to expose it to unfair criticism, and still more those who, by countenancing the illegal importation of intoxicating liquor into the States, hamper the carrying out of the American people's decision. Especially the Conference views with apprehension any action which would necessitate measures being taken to alter the specific character of the one great

unguarded frontier' of the world between Canada and the United States.

The Conference feels very strongly that the effective witness of the Christian conscience on great social issues depends on the development of Christian Social Councils in which the congregations of the various Christian Churches are represented. Such Councils not only enable the Christian Church to exercise effective influence in local affairs, but also help to foster goodwill and the spirit of co-operation among all Christian people, and so encourage common effort in evangelistic work.

The experience of this short Conference indicates that similar gatherings at home and abroad would strengthen the response to this special part of the Lambeth message to the Churches, and would also help the movement towards a larger spirit of Christian unity among all men of goodwill.

Signed on behalf of the Conference by :

SIR HENRY LUNN (*President*),

Anglican :

ARTHUR BRADFORD.

J. H. B. PLYMOUTH.

T. COOK (Archdeacon of Hastings).

W. J. MARGETSON (Rural Dean of Newington).

Baptist :

CHARLES BROWN, D.D. (Ex-President of the Baptist Union).

THOS. PHILLIPS (Bloomsbury Baptist Chapel).

Congregational : F. W. NORWOOD, D.D. (City Temple).

Presbyterian : J. CARNEGIE SIMPSON (Westminster College, Cambridge).

GWESSIN JENKINS (President of London Federation of Free Churches).

Methodist :

GEORGE ARMITAGE (Secretary of the Primitive Methodist Conference).

DAVID BROOK, D.C.L. (Ex-President of the United Methodist Conference).

H. MALDWYN HUGHES, D.D. (Wesleyan College, Cambridge).

J. E. RATTENBURY (West London Mission).

J. ARMSTRONG (Wesley's Chapel, City Road).

